















Wiseman, Nicholas P.

# HIGH-CHURCH CLAIMS:

or

A Series of Papers

on

The High-Church Theory, Anglican  
Claims to Apostolical Succession,  
etc.

London

Catholic Institute of Gt. Britain

1841

5480

# CONTENTS.

---

	Page
No. I.—Occasioned by the controversy respecting Dr. Hampden's appointment to the Divinity chair at Oxford in 1836 - -	1-16
II.—Occasioned by a Sermon by the Rev. John Keble, M.A. entitled, "Primitive Tradition recognised in Holy Scripture," and an article, No. XL. of the "British Critic" upon Dr. Wiseman's Controversial Lectures - - - - -	17-38
III.—Occasioned by the publication of the "Tracts for the Times."	41-62
<i>Note.</i> —There is an hiatus in the paging between pages 38 and 41.	
IV.—Occasioned by the "Tracts for the Times," and the publication of a new edition of the works of the Rev. Richard Hooker, with additions, arranged by the Rev. John Keble -	63-84
V.—Occasioned by the publication of the "Tracts for the Times," &c. - - - - -	85-117
VI.—Occasioned by the publication of the "Remains of the late Rev. H. Froude, M.A." - - - - -	119-133

N.B. To keep No. VI. within the compass of a sheet, it was necessary to occupy the back of the title, the retention of which in collecting the Tracts for publication in the present shape was rendered indispensable.

**Just Published.**

*Price Five Shillings and Sixpence bound in Cloth and Lettered, with a Facsimile  
of the Letter of His Holiness Pope Gregory XVI.*

**Vol. I. of the TRACTS published under the Superintendence  
of the Catholic Institute of Great Britain, from 1 to 38 inclusive.**

---

*Also a New Edition, carefully compared with the Original, of*

**BOSSUET'S EXPOSITION OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH.**

*Price One Shilling bound in Cloth.*

---

*In the Press and speedily will be Published, under the superintendence of the  
Catholic Institute,*

**THE**

**CONFERENCE BETWEEN BOSSUET AND CLAUDE.**

**AND**

**THE QUESTION OF QUESTIONS,**

**BY JOSEPH MUMFORD, S. J.**

# TRACT N<sup>o</sup>. I.

OCCASIONED BY THE CONTROVERSY RESPECTING  
DR. HAMPDEN'S APPOINTMENT TO THE DIVINITY  
CHAIR AT OXFORD IN 1836.

---

WE feel obliged to confess, that, in looking over the controversial tracts which the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the theological chair of Oxford has called into being, our minds have been crossed by feelings, which we scarcely know how to reconcile together, or even to analyse, with satisfaction to ourselves. On the one hand we see learned and zealous, and we have reason to believe, in some instances, amiable men, contending, in the spirit which belongs to a better Church and a better cause, in favour of a rigid adherence to principles and doctrines which *we* must approve; yet, thereby departing from the consistency of their professed faith, and betraying how powerless they are in wielding the weapons which it has long since blunted, and then thrown aside. On the other side, we see the professor *elect* accused, not unjustly, of rash and dangerous opinions in his earlier works, but yet most unjustly cited to answer for them, upon principles which his accusers themselves had no right to adopt. For he is charged not so much with heterodoxy in faith, as with violating articles, that can pretend to no power of binding the internal belief.

But the anomalies of the system, which this controversy has exposed, are still farther exhibited by the new position, wherein the professor *installed* has placed himself. His inaugural discourse appears; in it all is conformable to what his opponents could require; the doctrine of the Trinity is no longer the result of "a combination of the judgments of speculative reason, with the prescriptions of authority," or "an exact scientific view of the principle of causation,"\* the sacramental influence is no longer the consequence of a "general belief in magic in the early ages of the Church;"† transubstantiation is no more a doctrine which, as "a simple opinion, might have had no harm in it,"‡ but all is just what the most zealous supporter of the Church articles could desire; the Trinity, as in them taught, cannot be denied "without expunging the Scriptures themselves,"§ the sacrament of regeneration is efficacious as a means of grace, through Christ's blessing, "so as to be indispensable to

---

\* Theological statements, pp. 17, 19.

† Ib. p. 61.

‡ Ib. p. 58.

§ Inaugural Lect. p. 9.

all within the reach of it,"\* and, as a peace-offering perhaps to more relentless spirits, transubstantiation is "rejected as a fond notion."† Not only in these points, but in many others, the impartial reader of the works before us will see manifest variations of opinion, not to say glaring contradictions.

But is the blame of this to be cast upon Dr. Hampden? Assuredly not. Had he been a teacher in our Church, had he made his profession of faith amongst us, we might have been startled at such a change; because we could have discovered no principle in the mind of a Catholic theologian, whereby it could be justified. But where the religion itself admits the possibility of variation in the whole collective Church, and supposes, that to-day it may be plunged into idolatry or gross superstition, and to-morrow rise regenerated and purified from the laver of a reformation, it is surely unreasonable to expect, that its individual teachers shall have preserved consistency through the growing experience of life. We do not mean to insinuate that the professorial chair can have, or has had, a magical influence upon the opinions of its occupant, or that it is an infallible nostrum for the cure of heterodoxy. For the professor's adversaries absolve him from all *formal* guilt in this respect, as the schoolmen call it. Dr. Pusey says, that what they have written, "it should be plainly understood, has not been done with any idea of passing judgment upon the personal faith of Dr. Hampden." "On the contrary," he adds, "we believe that the earlier faith planted in the soul yet survives, and we trust and pray that it may survive, unharmed if possible, by the later philosophical system, which has been admitted into the intellect."‡ The report of the Committee appointed, March 5, by the Corpus meeting, makes the same declaration, and is careful in stating that "they are far from imputing to Dr. Hampden personally those unchristian doctrines, with which his system" (characterised in the preceding paragraph as the *theory of rationalism*) "is closely connected, or the consequences inevitably flowing from it."§

Here, then, is an admission of inward orthodoxy in the accused professor, while his outward teaching is in direct opposition to the principles of faith which he has professed, and to the articles of religion which he has solemnly subscribed. Yet even here there is no inconsistency, upon the principles maintained by distinguished divines of the English Church: though the usual order of proceeding is obviously reversed. For Dr. Hampden is acknowledged inwardly to believe according to the doctrines prescribed, and only charged with outwardly professing what is at variance with them; whereas, the more ordinary theory is, that the subscribers of the articles may in their heart reject them, while outwardly they shape their teaching in conformity to them. Which species of discrepancy between the heart and the hand is the more reprehensible, we leave candid readers to determine. Bishop Bramhall says of the thirty-nine articles, that they are "only pious opinions fitted for the preservation of unity; neither do

\* Inaug. Lect. p. 14. † Ibid. ‡ "Theological Statements," p. iii.

§ "Letter to His Grace the Archb. of Canterbury," p. 32.



we oblige any man to believe them, but only not to contradict them."\* Dr. Hey, when actually Norrisian professor of theology in the sister university, asserted in his Lectures, that "the sense of the articles is to be determined by circumstances." Dr. Balguy is still more explicit; for he says, "the articles are not exactly what we might wish them to be. Some of them are expressed in doubtful terms; others are inaccurate, perhaps unphilosophical; others, again, may chance to mislead an ignorant reader into same erroneous opinions; but is there any one among them that leads to immorality?" Such is his opinion of the articles; now, hear what he says of subscription and mental adherence to them. "I am far from wishing to discourage the clergy of the Established Church from thinking for themselves, or from speaking what they think, nor even from writing. I say nothing against the right of private judgment or speech, I only contend that men ought not to attack the Church from those very pulpits, in which they were placed for her defence."

Now, Dr. Balguy, as Dr. Milner remarks,† was the most strenuous opposer of those clergymen, who, in 1772, petitioned the legislature to be relieved from the burthen of subscription; and his sermons, from which this passage is drawn, were dedicated to the King. The theory therefore of these, and many other divines of the establishment, whom we could quote, is that the articles are not obligatory on the conscience, but only "articles of peace," which need not be believed, but must not be publicly, or rather *officially*, impugned. And if in Dr. Balguy's text we simply substitute *chair* for *pulpit*, Dr. Hampden's justification is complete; nay, he may go on still philosophising on the articles, and analysing them in speech and writing, till he has sublimated them into a vapoury breath, so long as from the chair which he now holds, he shall not gainsay their solidity!

Surely this is strange doctrine; but it is not ours; it is the strait to which the right of freedom in religious opinion, on the one side, and the exacted submission to subscription on the other, have, by alternate and repeated blows, driven the theological science of the Establishment. It is the doctrine not merely of this, but of foreign communions too; the clergy of Geneva continued to subscribe to the Divinity of our Lord, long after belief in that doctrine had been openly disavowed among them: Michaelis maintains that the adhesion, by subscription, to formularies of faith, only extends to outward profession, and not to interior conviction;‡ and Semler bitterly complained that men should be compelled to subscribe such documents, when according to the very principles of the Reformation, it was tyrannical to exact a profession of belief even in the inspiration of Scripture.§ But if such has been the belief of so many

---

\* This is the language so severely blamed in Dr. H. "Pious opinions," (such as "the doctrinal statements of our articles") are not parts of revelation."—"Elucidations," p. 43.

† "End of religious controversy," Lct. xi.

‡ In an Essay on the Possibility of Effecting a Union of Religions, in his "Commentationes, R. S. Götting. prælectæ." Not having the work at hand, we cannot refer more accurately.

§ In his Preface to his Abridgment of Schultens's Commentary on Proverbs.

dignitaries and lights of the Protestant Church, Dr. Hampden has surely no reason to be challenged and summoned before any tribunal, for acting in conformity to it. On the contrary, we fancy he has not come up to the measure of dispensation to which those opinions and declarations seem to entitle the conscience; for, once more, we observe, that he is acquitted of believing anything at variance with the established creed.

How, then, are we to solve this mystery, and account for the jealousy now felt regarding the *former* opinions of Dr. Hampden? Did not a prelate of the English Church, of whom, as lately taken from among the living, we wish not harshly to speak, translate and make known in this country one of the most dangerous, because one of the most covert and moderate rationalists of Germany? and did not his notes, partly by not reaching through the entire work, partly by the dilutedness of their antidote, by their illustrating rather than removing the danger, greatly add to the mischief? And yet if Dr. Herbert Marsh was the importer and propagator of rationalism, was not the Margaret Professor, and Bishop of Peterborough, a zealous churchman, and the unrelenting foe to popery? Ought not this example to have given hopes of others, that when placed in high places of responsibility, the spirit of their order would come forth, and flourish perhaps the fresher, for their early and partial blight? But it is not difficult to discover the secret springs which have been here at work; and inasmuch as therein are found the latent germs of principles which we would gladly see avowed in the face of heaven, we must feel an interest in watching the course of the accusation.

That the individuals, who call Dr. Hampden to account, are leading men among the High Church party, is sufficiently understood. The history of this section of the Anglican Church it is not our province to trace; but we believe that we may compare it to the theory, which Dr. Gilly, and other fanciful writers, have imagined for that Church itself.\* For, these gentlemen, unable to get rid of the universal domination of popery during so many centuries, have devised a species of mythological protestantism; which, like the Homeric deities, was invisible save occasionally, as a thin vapoury phantasm appearing amidst the turmoil of controversial warfare, but yet really existed in its Idas and Olympuses amidst the mountains of Savoy, until it came forth, in bodily substance, as a celestial Avatar, from the head of Luther. And so, do we really believe, that the party in the Church, to which Dr. Hampden's impugnors belong, hold their only true and semi-visible Church to have existed pure, until this day, amidst the wilder theories of protestantism; always bearing with it some precious remnants and relics of good old catholicity, upholding the authoritative teaching of Christ's Church, and the true efficacy of his sacraments, and reverencing and perhaps regretting many of those institutions, which the hurricane of the reformation recklessly swept away.

The genealogy of this Church-party is easily traced, with occasional breaks, from one advocate to another of principles too obviously Catholic;

---

\* See the Rev. James Wheeler's short, but triumphant, reply to Dr. Gilly's work entitled, "Our Protestant Forefathers." Durham, 1835

sometimes the depreciators of ecclesiastical rule are for a brief space the lords of the ascendant; at others the star of the Church culminates in the political and literary sphere; but still it has ever continued to live, and the opinions, which this controversy have brought out, have circulated, with alternations of languor and of activity, through the body of the Establishment. In the "Report" above alluded to, the head and front of Dr. Hampden's offending is, his having no "regard to those rules and principles of interpretation, which have guided *the judgments* of Christ's Holy Catholic Church in all ages of its history, and under every variety of its warfare."

Again, the committee write as follows:—

"They (the Committee) suggest and submit it (a declaration) to you, as a measure, which, while it removes from us a charge of supineness or indifference, may warn the younger part of our students against immediate danger, and will solemnly declare to the world *our resolution to hold fast those great laws of Scripture-Interpretation and Scripture-Proof, which we inherit from our ancestors in the faith.*"—p. 33.

Is this Oxford or Salamanca that speaks? Is it Corpus Christi College or the Sorbonne? First, a dogmatical condemnation of opinions; secondly, a censure on the same; thirdly, the *judgments* of the Church; fourthly, this is no other than the *Holy Catholic Church*; fifthly, this Church guided *through all ages* by the same *sound* principles, for this is implied in the jealousy wherewith they are to be guarded; sixthly, these same *sound* principles in all ages observed *in every warfare*, therefore against Berengarius, Wicklif, the Waldenses—why not Luther? seventhly, these principles to be derived from ancestors in the faith; eighthly, no law of Scripture-proof to be admitted, save what is thus inherited;—surely these are not the distinctive principles, and acts, and terms of a Protestant clergy, and a Protestant university! We doubt not that those who signed the Report would reply in the affirmative, and seriously and earnestly maintain that such has always been the conduct and the belief of their Church. Alas! we wish it had been so. For had these principles been always practically upheld in England, never would the sad separation have occurred, which has rent this country from its mother Church. Others, however, will not so easily see the conformity between these principles and those whereon the Reformation was originally based, but will refuse to believe that the thick wall of separation which it was intended at the era of that event to place between popery and the new religions, was in reality so thin a film, as it must here appear. The author of the Letter to His Grace of Canterbury, above referred to, reads catholicity in every line of the Report. For thus he writes:\*

"I venture to affirm, without risk of contradiction, or at least of confutation, that the doctrine involved in both the above cited passages is much more manifestly at variance with the characteristic principle of Protestantism, and with the practice of the English Established Church, than any other doctrine extracted from Dr. Hampden's writings."—p. 37.

---

\* "Letter," p. 32.

Again—

“The Roman Catholic doctrine would, if such admission were made, have a manifest advantage over every Protestant Church, inasmuch as the rules and principles of her interpretation, and her interpretation itself, if not more ancient or more uniform, have unquestionably been more prevalent during many ages of the Church, and have been more distinctly inherited from ancestors in the same faith, than any articles, expositions, or confessions of faith, adopted by the Church of England, or recommended by any Protestant community on earth. I know not to what conclusion a theory like Dr. Hampden’s, founded on the belief of the Scriptures, and entire freedom in interpreting them, might lead a rash or intrepid disputant, but I am morally certain that the slavish doctrines propounded in the Corpus Report would compel every consistent reasoner, who adopted it, to acknowledge an *infallible* Church. When we once start on the line of *infallibility*, it is obvious at what goal we must arrive.—*Tendimus in Latium*. We may bawl out No Popery! on the road, but we must put up at the Old Lady of Babylon’s at last.”—p. 40.

This is consistent reasoning; and we can forgive some words in it which we like not, in consideration of its general sense. It is only another illustration of what Catholics have repeatedly observed, that if two contending parties arise in the Protestant Church, the one is driven to tax the other with Socinianism, and that other retorts with the accusation of Popery. It only confirms what every Catholic must feel, that the rejection of a principle of authority necessarily leads, theoretically at least, to the rejection of all mystery, and so to Socinianism, while its adoption obliges its supporter to reason on principles purely Catholic. This tendency of the party at Oxford to run into Catholic principles for shelter, has necessarily attracted the attention of many. It has been developed by the author of a pamphlet intitled a “Pastoral Epistle from His Holiness the Pope to some Members of the University of Oxford.” Imitating in some respects, Sir R. Steele’s device of a letter to the Pope, complaining that the Protestant Church laid claim to as much authority and infallibility as himself, the writer introduces the Sovereign Pontiff in person, accepting and commending the opinions set forth in the “Tracts for the Times,” by members of that University. In reading this curious production, we could not help sometimes imagining that a better feeling than mere love of sarcasm came over the writer’s mind, and that his imagination gradually warmed with his subject into an enthusiastic regret, that he could not say in truth what seemed so beautiful even in sportive phrase. One instance of text and commentary will suffice to explain our meaning. The Tracts write as follows:—

“The Catholic ritual was a precious possession; and if we who have escaped from Popery have lost not only the possession, but the sense of its value, it is a serious question, whether we are not like men who recover from some grievous illness with the loss or injury of their sight or hearing;—whether we are not like the Jews returned from captivity, who could never find the rod of Aaron, or the ark of the covenant, which indeed had ever been hid from the world, but then was removed from the temple itself.”—Tract, No. xxxiv.

Upon this passage, the Pope is thus imagined to comment:—

“Oh, when you have returned to the temple, with what joy will you behold

the rod of Aaron and the ark of the covenant still preserved in its mystic depositaries. With what delight will you behold the splendour of our ritual! What new sensations of piety will throb within your bosoms, as you prostrate yourselves with reverence before our holy altar. The ark of the covenant will be presented to your view; the real cross will offer itself to your vision; the relics of martyrs will animate your devotions; nor will you be pained by the absence of prayer (which you say has been excluded from the English ritual) 'for the rest and peace of all those who have departed this life in God's faith and fear.' You have justly remarked, that 'prayers for the dead' formed a portion of those liturgies which have emanated from St. Peter, St. James, St. Mark, and St. John;\* and when you join us in these devotions, you will feel a new proof within you, that the Church, which has retained this office, is alone worthy of your regard."—p. 25.

Sincerely do we hope that the writer of these words, in true dramatic feeling, invested, or rather identified himself, with the character which he personated, and could not but feel the æsthetic beauty, at least, of the ordinances which he recommends. Gladly do we adopt his language, and with all the earnestness of sincere zeal, and all the cordiality of brotherly charity, express our assurance that what he writes is but the truth, and that the emotions which he describes are the real and consistent consequences of a practical adoption of what that party theoretically approve.

We are not chimerical in our views, or over sanguine in our expectations; but we are confident that if the divines, who have censured Dr. Hampden, would calmly look upon their principles, without the dread of Popery in their hearts to stifle better feeling, if they would fearlessly pursue their own doctrines to their farthest consistent conclusions, they would surely find that they have unguardedly, perhaps unknowingly, rejected the principles of the Reformation, and returned to thoughts and feelings which belong to other times, or at least to another Church. Unfortunately, experience, trite and vulgar as it may be, has sanctioned the aphorism that the repulsive action between two religions, the *odium theologicum*, (the substantive we reject most heartily on the Catholic side) is in the inverse ratio of the square of their distance: and therefore we fear, that any one of those who have been zealously trying Catholic weapons against the alleged semi-Socinianism of the Regius Professor, would turn round and be as ready to close with us in wager of battle, did we but tap him on the shoulder, and politely hint that he had taken, by mistake, our sword and buckler. But we are willing to hope that times are mended; and that a better spirit, a generous love of truth, has descended among our generation, and that we may safely argue our cause, without danger of exciting any unworthy feelings. Let us then gird up our loins, and contend together in a friendly spirit.

Nothing can be more clear, as we before explained, than that, in the Established Church, there has been a series of learned divines whose opinions approximated greatly to catholic truth; who thought that the

---

\* Tracts, No. lxiii.

Reformation, however necessary, overdid its work. They have regretted the licentiousness of religious opinion which it introduced, by removing the wholesome and necessary restraint of a dogmatic authority in the Church. But is it fair to identify the opinions of these men, however learned, with the establishment to which they belonged? Were they, in the first place, ever considered otherwise than as a party, or, if you prefer it, a *part* of the Anglican Church? Were there not always many who opposed them in their views? Can it even be said that the great body of the flock followed them in their doctrines, and claimed not, rather in their despite, the privilege of individual judgment? And has not the growing increase of sectarianism proved that the body of their Church insists on this right, and exercises it to the utmost? And, in the second place, is not the very complaint, so constantly uttered by this party, of too much having been done at the Reformation, the regret that outward pomp of worship, and many religious institutions, were then abolished, a sufficient proof that they represent not those who caused and accomplished that unhappy revolution?

No one, we believe, save themselves, will maintain that they represent the English Church, such as the Reformation intended it to appear in harsh and unyielding contrast to the Catholic doctrine on the subject. But let us proceed in our examination. It is supposed, then, that the Church of England, as conceived by these divines, holds and maintains an authority in matters of faith. Several important questions immediately arise.

First, we would ask, where does this definitive power reside? The Catholic not only believes that his Church possesses such an authority, but at once, unhesitatingly declares where it is deposited. He holds that the pastors of the Church, in council assembled, are assisted by the Holy Spirit to a certainty of decision. The case is contemplated and provided for: he can tell you who may call such an assembly—who must preside at it—by whom its decrees must be ratified—how they are to be promulgated—what extent of obligation they may impose. All is as clear, as definite, as regular, as the provisions of the statute-book for the legislative functions of our national council. The dogma is complete, it is carried fearlessly, like every other Catholic principle, to its farthest consequences. But if the Protestant English Church has authority, in whose hands is it placed? Suppose that a serious controversy arose within it;—suppose that these its zealous members wished to pronounce judgment upon Dr. Hampden's opinions, whose duty would it become? Would the convocation meet for the purpose; or would each university have dogmatical authority? Would the Archbishop of Canterbury be justified by precedent, or by usage, or by inherent right, to call a council of the English Church, and at its head pronounce an authoritative decision? Surely, if their doctrine were that of their Church, there would have been proper provision made in its articles for it; and a Protestant child would be able to tell you, as a Catholic one can, where the authority of his Church reposes. Instead of this, we have a vague clause in the 20th Article, that it has autho-

rity in matters of faith. But this very clause is most probably spurious and interpolated;\* and its power is completely annulled by its contradictory restrictions.†

In the next place, we would ask, how is this power to be exercised? If it exists, or is believed to exist, God knows there have been plenty of occasions in our days to call it into activity. We cannot, indeed, consider more urgent cases for its application than many which have arisen. Socinianism has stalked abroad in open day, and in the high places of the Church; fanaticism and self-sufficiency have rent vast masses from its communion into sectarianism; latitudinarianism has crept like a subtle poison through its ranks; and yet we never see, or have seen, this Church arouse itself to exercise its privilege of dispelling error, and sealing with its sanction the orthodox faith. Nay, it has been even cogently urged, how came it that Dr. Hampden, after delivering his "theory of rationalism" in the Bampton Lectures, was successively made Principal of St. Mary's Hall, Doctor of Divinity, and Professor of Moral Theology?‡ If the Church take cognizance of opinions, or claim the right of condemning erroneous doctrines, either it is sadly inefficient for its purpose, or it must wait very extreme cases for the exercise of its power. Then what is the form in which its decisions are issued? Are they merely declarations of its belief, or are they positive definitions in the name of God, and with the supposed guidance of his Spirit? Would they be binding on the consciences of men, or only motives to be weighed by them in coming, in their private judgment, to a right decision? These again are all matters which a Catholic well understands, simply because his Church claims and exercises a right of deciding in matters of faith; and they would be as explicit in the Church of England, did it pretend to a similar power.

After this, we would ask, how is this right, if exercised, to be enforced? For, as a wise old poet writes,

"The law lives only where the law doth breed  
Obedience to the works it binds us to."

Do those who have signed the Corpus declaration or report, imagine that the body of Churchmen are aware of a deposit of principles being in their hands, "inherited from ancestors in the faith," which alone are available to Scripture-proof, and Scripture-interpretation; so that all will bow implicitly, upon some one endowed with proper authority—who, we know not—coming forward and stating, in a dogmatical tone, that such only is the true doctrine, *because* it is that of the Church? Would not such a decision be as the apple of discord among their ranks, and raise the war-cry of Popery against them?

How different the case is in the Catholic Church, the experience of our own times may abundantly declare. It is not long since a bold and

---

\* See the "Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church, by N. Wiseman, D.D." Lect. II. p. 29, note.

† *Ib.* p. 29, 30.

‡ *Letter*, p. 5.

mighty genius, after having fought and conquered the rampant infidelity of the last age, and indifference, its baneful progeny in this, had gathered around him a band of fresh and youthful minds, free from either taint, panting after what is pure and holy, and eager to be led, under his banner, to the sacred war. In an ill-fated hour, he swerved, like Tertullian, from the very principles by which he had so often confuted error, and suffered the suggestions of an enthusiastic imagination to prevail over the former convictions of his mind. The Head of the Church pronounced his award of disapprobation—he yielded not; but he has ever since stood like a scathed and shattered oak, which the lightning has touched, the energies of his mind exhausted, the intellectual sap dried up; and of all those whom he trained and cherished, not one has followed him in his disobedience; they have all wept and mourned over his fall, but their principles have been stronger than their affections, and they have remained banded together, but under the best and only sure guide—the Church itself which they defend.\*

Another, and a more remarkable instance has occurred. At Strasbourg, the love of philosophising in religion, precisely the fault found with Dr. Hampden, had led away into rash opinions one whose learning and virtues were an ornament to the clergy; and as one great star may draw after it a third part of the host of heaven, so had he brought into the same dangerous opinions others of a kindred spirit. His Bishop condemned and expostulated, and the authority vested in him soon triumphed. On the 18th of last November, the erring parties signed a declaration, wherein they virtually renounced their opinions, and this was the next day published by the Bishop to his flock, for their edification. The most striking circumstance, however, is that the chief of this party was a convert, at a rather advanced period of life, from Protestantism; his mind had not been accustomed from infancy to habitual respect for such authority; but so essential must this feeling appear to any one that embraces Catholicity, and so fast does it seize upon his mind, that its power becomes superior to every other influence, and secures him against its action. And to the Catholic, the man who could thus sacrifice every selfish idea and feeling of pride to this beautiful and most sacred principle, is greater in mind and soul, than all the glories of a brilliant philosophy could ever make its founder.

Here then is manifestly a Church which claims to rule by authority and power. The entire system of its construction shows this vital principle. But try to trace the necessary organs for a corresponding action in the Anglican Church, which some affect to think lives by a similar power, and you will blunt your dissecting knife in vain. You will not discover any means, nor any force, requisite for such a principle. In fact, nothing, we believe, is generally considered more clear, than that this belief or theory is an opinion *in* and not *of* the English Church; nay that it goes greatly to overthrow or weaken the fundamental principles of the Reformation.

---

\* It is this hopeful phalanx, in great part, which undertook and has carried on the publication of the learned Journal, entitled the *Université Catholique*.



It is, indeed, easy, and, we will add, distressing, to see how carefully the terms used by Catholics on these subjects are shunned ; there seems to be a fear of too plainly betraying the esoteric doctrines of the sect ; nay more, a dread of fairly looking them in the face, lest they should resemble Popery. It is manifest, that if the principles of these learned Collegians were boldly pushed forward to their last and consistent consequences, the establishment of the Catholic doctrine must necessarily ensue. Divines of this class, whether living or dead, have been more than once subservient to the spread of Catholicity. The late Mr. Vaughan of Leicester, was ever most assiduous in preaching to his Protestant flock, on the High-Church doctrine of authority in matters of faith, on the sin of dissent, and the unsafety of those who submitted and adhered not to the Church ; and the consequence was, that several of his congregation, convinced by his arguments, but following them up to their real conclusions, passed over to the Catholic faith, and became zealous members of our holy religion. We had the pleasure of being acquainted with one who for years had exercised the ministry, in the Established religion, but became a convert to the truth, and, in his old age, took orders in the Church. We asked him, on one occasion, by what course he had been brought to embrace our religion, with so many sacrifices. He informed us, that he had always been a zealous High-Churchman, and had studied and held the opinions of the old English Divines. He had thus firmly upheld the authority of the Church ; he had believed in the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the blessed Eucharist ; he had regretted the destruction of ceremony and religious symbols in worship, and had fully satisfied himself, on the authority of his leaders, that many Catholic practices, usually much decried, were blameless, and might be even salutary. His religious principles being thus formed upon the doctrines of that school, he could not avoid noticing that, practically, they were not held by the Church in which he had learnt them ; he looked around him for some place where they might be found, and, to his astonishment, discovered, that among Catholics his theory of Christianity alone existed, in a perfect and harmonious scheme. He had little or nothing to change ; he merely transferred his allegiance from a party to a Church, and became Catholic that he might remain a consistent Protestant !

Dr. Hampden, in his inaugural discourse, seems to us no less confused and fearful of boldly facing his opinions, in his declaration regarding the relative value of Scripture, and of authority. He obviously wishes to give a certain weight to the latter ; and, did our space permit us, we should be glad to analyse his consequences, mutually contrasted. It would be found, that the authority attributed to the Church is so vague and ill-defined, as to amount to a mere name ; that it is but an interpretative authority, which resides no one can tell where, and is to be exercised nobody knows how.\*

A similar contradiction is discoverable in his professions regarding the blessed Eucharist. On this subject he thus writes :—

---

\* See his Inaug. Lecture, p. 18.

“ Our Church, indeed, has rejected the fond notion of transubstantiation ; but does not, therefore, the less hold a *real vital presence* of Christ in the sacrament. The Church forbids our holding the doctrine of a *corporal* presence, and yet does not presume to overlook the strong words of Christ, declaring ‘ this is my body,’ ‘ this is my blood,’ ‘ and he that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him ;’ and will not, therefore, incur the impiety of emptying this holy sacrament of its gifted treasure of grace. And thus, it is asserted in the catechism, the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper.”—Page 14.

Our blessed Saviour yet exists in the body ; at the right hand of the Father he sits with our glorified flesh, from which he is no more to be severed. To say that he is *really* present, and yet not *bodily* present, is a new mystery, involving delicate points of sublime theology, nowhere revealed in Scripture. Dr. H. admits the force, not only of the instituting formula, but even of the long contested sixth chapter of St. John, which he here applies towards proving, that the sacrament is not a mere symbol, but contains the *real* presence of our Saviour. But surely so accurate a distinction between one sort of presence and another should have been drawn in the New Testament : And to conclude, inductively of the Eucharist, “ *here is the body of Christ,*” when he said, “ *This is my body,*”—and reject as *fond* the doctrine which takes the latter proposition quite literally, is a strange perversion of all logical propriety. For, are the words to be taken literally, so as to include a real presence ? Then transubstantiation, which so takes them, is no fond notion. Are they to be interpreted figuratively ? Then there is no farther ground for Dr. Hampden’s *real, vital* presence. To say they shall be taken literally so far, and no farther, is drawing a line, of which we require a demonstration. Moreover, if according to the learned doctor, the *real* presence is evinced by a passage which tells us that Christ’s *flesh* and *blood* are received, it is not easy to see how such an expression, at the same time, condemns a *corporal* presence. It would be difficult more positively to express this than by its constituents, *flesh* and *blood*. There is another error in this paragraph. We are told that the English “ Church forbids our holding the doctrine of a corporal presence ;” and yet the catechism is quoted to prove that the body and blood of Christ are really taken. Now, we believe that it is pretty well ascertained, that the catechism was so framed upon this head, as to allow, by the wideness of its meshes, Catholics to enter into the net : that the doctrine of the Eucharist was purposely kept so vague, as to be reconcilable with our belief ; and that, therefore, the cited words were purposely intended to *include*, and not to forbid, the Catholic dogma of a corporal presence. The entire catechism offends more by omission than by actual error, at least if we except one answer, which, after all, is equivocal. We allude to the number of sacraments, as there stated ; “ Two only, as generally necessary for salvation, that is to say, baptism and the supper of the Lord.” This may be so interpreted as not to exclude the other five, but only to declare those which are necessary for all ; and in this sense the answer is correct.

It is time, however, for us to conclude. Of Dr. Hampden we say once more, that whatever discrepancy there may be between his former doctrines and the Church articles, or the opinions of his opponents, it should not be laid to his charge, where latitude of opinion has been always considered a privilege and a right. The Government has been severely blamed for appointing him to a chair, after the University had conferred three successive dignities on him, since his ill-starred Lectures. This censure we think likewise unjust. We think sincerely, that, had the government appointed any of those who signed the Report, or appealed to His Grace of Canterbury, they would have sanctioned a wider departure from the acknowledged principles of Anglicanism than they can possibly have sanctioned now. For the doctrines which that party maintain, however they approximate nearer to what we hold for truth, are as widely dissentient from the very basis of Protestantism, as those of the new Professor.

Do we mean then to join in the clamour which has been raised against them? Assuredly not. We gladly close our eyes to all consideration of personal motives or feelings which have been thought to prevail in this controversy, and we are willing to look upon it as a study of contending principles. For we believe that sincere regret has been felt by this party, at what they consider the exaltation of opinions hostile to their views of the Church and of its doctrines. But if they would look steadily at their own position, now rendered more manifest by the issue of the contest, they would feel that they are vainly trying to raise their Church to the standard of influence and power which their affections have devised. They would feel that they are only one small section of it, tending to dissent from its essential principles. We can sympathise with their feelings. We can well conceive the painful disappointment which an ardent spirit must feel, when having fixed its eagerest ambition upon the establishment of a favourite theory, it finds a clog upon its efforts in the very cause it has espoused. We can well imagine a youthful mind, after having lived, in spirit, amidst the heroes of ancient Christianity, after having studied in the conduct of an Athanasius, how the Church may clothe her arm with thunder, when heresy assails her, after having satisfied himself that the Bible never was the rule of faith, but the Church its teacher,\* try to apply in practice these lessons and convictions, and sigh to discover that the machinery is broken in pieces, and the springs all relaxed, which then seemed to act with such mighty force. We can conceive the inward regrets of one who has picked out with beautiful skill, and woven into a golden chain, the few grains of poetic feeling which the torrent of the Reformation tore from the ancient Church, and has preserved in the dry and sandy desolation of its "Christian year;" upon seeing how much fit matter for a muse like his has been indiscriminately and unfeelingly swept away, how much nobler and more moving themes he would have pos-

---

\* See "The Arians of the Fourth Century," p. 49 et seqq.

essed, had that touch been gentler, which broke off the flowers, when it pretended but to prune the plant.

But only let these ideas be indulged to the utmost; let those who thus reason, and who thus feel upon religion, only boldly pursue their respective trains of thought unto their ends. Let them construct, in mind, the Church which would realize their conceptions, the religion which would embody their ideas of perfection: and there can be little doubt what the result would be. They would pass from the dreams of theory to a reality which would satisfy their warmest longings, and fill the measure of their just desires.

## No. 2.

*Occasioned by a SERMON by the REV. JOHN KEBLE, M.A.  
entitled "Primitive Tradition recognized in Holy Scripture,"  
and an Article in No. XL. of the "British Critic," upon DR.  
WISEMAN'S Controversial Lectures.*

---

THE fearless and uncompromising revival of High-Church principles by a small body of youthful, learned, and as far as we have opportunity of knowing, amiable clergymen, in the face of much unpopular feeling, of great alienation from their brethren, and of little encouragement from their superiors, does credit to their sincerity and to their zeal. They have placed themselves in a prominent position, and in the post of honourable danger. They have endeavoured to throw outworks beyond the acknowledged precincts of their Church's walls, to protect them against the encroaching lines of dissent; and they have manned them, we think in forlorn hope, determined to keep the pressure of the attack at a greater distance. We, indeed, on our side, complain, and their more immediate adversaries—their rebels as they consider them—agree, that they have seized, for this purpose, upon a territory, not their own, but of our legitimate possession. They disclaim the charge, and affirm that they stand in a middle position—between "Romanism," as they choose to call it, and dissent. But, when they speak thus, it is not as a school, or a party; they boldly profess to declare the real sentiments of their church, "the Anglican," as they style it, considering it a part of the Catholic or universal Church of Christ dispersed over the world. Of this Church, "the Roman" is acknowledged to be a part, though they think it has not preserved purity of doctrine. But we must specify more in detail the principles of this school, and we trust we shall be found to do it with perfect impartiality.

First, then, "in the sense in which it is commonly understood at this day, Scripture is not, on Anglican principles, the Rule of Faith."\* It is, however, "its only standard, test, or depository."† There is, consequently, "a guide, though not an infallible one, but subordinate to Scripture. English theology considers that Scripture is not an easy book, and, as so considering, believes that Almighty God has been pleased to provide a guide. The twentieth article declares that the Church 'hath authority in controversies of faith.'"‡

Secondly, "the English doctrine does not encourage private judgment in matters of (necessary) faith, but maintains the Church's authority."§ In this respect the Anglican doctrine is "as distinct from Catholicism,||

\* British Critic, p. 388.

+ P. 385.

‡ P. 377.

§ P. 378.

|| Where we write 'Catholic' or its derivatives, the *Critic* has 'Romanist' and 'Romanism.' It is evident that these terms are not used in scorn; but our ears are not accustomed to hear them employed in any other way, and we trust we shall be excused if we refuse to admit them, and decline every other appellation but our own, simply 'Catholics.' By this substitution we feel we are doing an act of justice

as from common Protestantism. The Catholic gives to the existing Church the ultimate infallible decision in matters of saving faith; the Ultra-Protestant to the *individual*; and the Anglican to *antiquity*, giving authority to the Church as being the witness and voice, or rather the very presence of antiquity among us.\* The authority of the Church is, however, "subordinate to Scripture," inasmuch as she "may indeed pronounce doctrines as *true*, which are not in Scripture, so that they are not against it; but she may not declare points to be necessary to salvation, and act accordingly, unless she professes to derive them from Scripture. Her decision in such extra-scriptural matters is not secure from error; is entitled to veneration, but has not, strictly speaking, *authority*, and therefore may not rightly be *enforced*."† All this, nevertheless, is not to be understood of any particular Church, but gives as its results, "that the whole Church, all over the world, will never agree in teaching and enforcing what is not true."‡

Furthermore, the Church of England, being "an independent apostolic Church, a branch of the Catholic Church of Christ,"§ "claims the spiritual allegiance of the people, to the exclusion of *all rival claims*;" "the duty of communion with her is founded upon reasons derived from absolute religious obligation;" and hence we Catholics, "of these countries, are very justly charged with schism;"|| while "Wesley was a heresiarch."¶

Such we believe to be an accurate summary of the doctrines, maintained by the party whose organ is the *British Critic*, concerning the Rule of Faith. We have woven into our account the very expressions of that journal, because it seems so excessively jealous of any mistake about its principles, and reproaches its opponents repeatedly for drawing their ideas on the subject from authorities which its friends reject. Before, however, analyzing, as we intend, this scheme of Church authority, we must be allowed to dwell at some length upon Mr. Keble's sermon.

Its text is 2 Tim. i. 14, "That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us." Before he closes with the real subject of his discourse, the Professor endeavours to establish a parallel between the circumstances of Timothy, when addressed in these words, and the clergy of the Anglican Church in these its calamitous times. He then divides his discourse into three parts, proposing these enquiries: *first*, what is the deposit or charge committed to Timothy; *secondly*, are the English clergy at present partakers of it; *thirdly*, have they the Holy Ghost dwelling in them for a faithful discharge of duty?

After some interesting remarks upon the word used for "deposit," in the text, and the probability of its being a conventional, ecclesiastical term, Mr. Keble concludes that the committed treasure consisted of *doctrine*. (p. 17.) This interpretation he farther confirms by the testimonies of the ancient fathers. "Upon the whole," he concludes, "we

---

to the "British Critic" and its party. For any of our readers who found in our extracts the term '*Romanists*,' and had not read the entire article, would confound its writer with that common herd of Protestant controversialists, who think there is an argument in a nickname. We use the term '*Anglican*,' because it is that adopted by the critic himself, when speaking of his own Church.

may assume with some confidence, that the good thing left in Timothy's charge, thus absolutely to be kept at all events, was the treasure of apostolical doctrines and Church rules; the rules and doctrines which made up the character of Christ's kingdom." (p. 20.)

2. Is a similar deposit yet in the hands of Christian ministers? "Some," says Mr. Keble, "will reply to this question at once. We have the Holy Scriptures, and we know for certain that they contain all that is important in Timothy's charge." He then asks, "Can this be proved? Must it not be owned, on fair consideration, that Timothy's deposit did comprise matter independent and distinct from the truths which are directly scriptural?" (p. 21.) In answer, we will give the preacher's own words, when he urges the reflection that the New Testament was not written at the date of this epistle.

"The holy writings themselves intimate that the persons to whom they were addressed were in possession of a body of truth and duty totally distinct from themselves, and independent of them. Timothy, for instance, a few verses after the text, is enjoined to take measures for the transmission, not of Holy Scripture, but of things which he had heard of St. Paul among many witnesses. The Thessalonians had been exhorted to hold the traditions which they had received, whether by word or apostolic letter." (p. 22.)

Here follow other texts usually urged by Catholics, after which the preacher proceeds as follows:

"If the words, the commandments, the tradition which the latest of these holy writers severally commend in these and similar passages, meant only or chiefly the Scriptures before written, would there not appear a more significant mention of those Scriptures; something nearer to the tone of our own divines, when they are delivering precepts on the rule of faith? As it is, the phraseology of the Epistles exactly concurs with what we should be led to expect, that the Church would be already in possession of the substance of saving truth, in a sufficiently systematic form, by the sole teaching of the Apostles. As long as that teaching itself, or the accurate recollection of it, remained in the world, it must have constituted a standard or measure of Christian knowledge, though it had never seemed good to the Almighty to confer on us the additional boon of the books of the New Testament."—p. 23.

The sentiments of the Fathers are then appealed to, as confirmatory of this opinion. "Do they not employ Church tradition," asks Mr. Keble, "as parallel to Scripture, not as derived from it? and consequently as fixing the interpretation of disputed texts, not simply by the judgment of the Church, but by the authority of that Holy Spirit which inspires the oral teaching itself, of which such tradition is the record;\*" Again: "If we will be impartial, we cannot hide it from ourselves, that this *unwritten* word, if it can be anyhow authenticated, must necessarily demand the same reverence from us," (as the written must have done from the early Christians, when they ascertained it,) "and for exactly the same reason—*because it is his word.*"†

But here the learned professor introduces a limitation necessary to prevent a last step over the Rubicon of Protestantism. When the Scriptures were thus written, they were so written as to "contain every fundamental point of doctrine;" so that now, "nothing is to be insisted on as a point of faith necessary to salvation, but what is contained in, or

\* P. 24. † The words in *italics* throughout these quotations are so in the original.

may be proved by, canonical Scripture.\* This second part of the discourse then closes by reducing to three classes the objects for which apostolical tradition is a rule. 1. "The system and arrangement of fundamental articles;" 2. "Interpretation of Scripture;" and 3. "Discipline, formularies, and rites of the Church."

This outline will leave in our readers no room for astonishment, that Mr. Keble's sermon should have been openly charged with Catholicism, or "Romanism." Now, we declare that, to a very great extent, the charge is well-grounded. Strike out a few sentences, in which he tacks his theory to the Thirty-nine Articles, and the sermon might have been preached in St. Peter's at Rome. Whether these few passages neutralize the body of the discourse, we leave it to the members of his Church to decide. How far his opinions are ours, that is, Catholic, we have a right to judge; how far they are, at the same time, those of his professed religion, let others see. But, in the mean time, we will offer some remarks which may be of use towards the passing of a rightful judgment.

Mr. Keble acknowledges that tradition preceded Scripture, and attested its canon. (p. 28.) The authority, too, of that tradition, was divine; it was based upon the commission given to the apostles to teach, "he that heareth you heareth me." (p. 32.) The tradition itself was God's "*unwritten word*." This authority, then, was paramount, for it had no co-ordinate; it was sole. Nay, more, it was all-sufficient; for it was the only "standard and measure of Christian knowledge." After a considerable lapse of time (according to the learned professor, "in the interval between Clement and Ignatius on the one hand, and Irenæus and Tertullian on the other, that is, after about TWO HUNDRED YEARS after Christ), "the canon of the New Testament had first become fixed and notorious;"† and then tradition lost its prerogatives, and Scripture became the sole standard. We ask, on what authority the assertion rests, or how is this substitution justified? Was the divine commission or authority withdrawn from the pastors, whose teaching, till now, had been the test or standard of truth? Had it been said, "he that heareth you heareth me, till a New Testament be written, after which your delivering of a doctrine will cease to be a ground for believing?" A right clearly conferred, and not limited by, or made dependent on, contingent events, requires a clear abrogation before it ceases. Traditional, authoritative teaching, *was* clearly appointed; the substitution of Scripture *never* was;‡ how then can this have abrogated, or even limited the other?

But, farther, Mr. Keble himself allows that "the all-sufficiency of Scripture is nowhere expressly affirmed in Scripture itself."§ Where, then, *is* it affirmed? If in tradition, let it be shown. Let us have passages sufficient to verify the rule *quod semper, quod ab omnibus, quod ubique*, declaratory that the Church despoiled herself, or considered herself despoiled, of that *complete* authority and *supreme* place which she had occupied in teaching truth, according to Mr. Keble's admission, previously to the decision of the scriptural canon. If no such passages, either many or few, can be quoted, as we are sure they cannot, we have nowhere any limitation made to the first authority, nor any



ground at all for the all-sufficiency of the Scripture in dogmatical teaching. Let us balance the admissions of this sermon—on the one hand, that originally, tradition, or a body of doctrines held in deposit by the Church, was the appointed and sufficient standard of faith, with a divine sanction—and on the other, that Scripture never claims all-sufficiency, or declares the cessation of the previous commission to teach; and we leave it to a candid reader to judge, whether the acknowledged rights of the earlier method of preserving truth can have been superseded by the introduction of the second. But if, as Mr. Keble intimates, (p. 31,) this substitution of Scripture for tradition, as the sufficient standard of dogma, is to be gathered from tradition itself, and if this doctrine of the articles is to be considered matter of faith, or rather the foundation of all Protestant faith; then we have an instance of a point of faith “not contained in, nor proved by, canonical Scripture,” but based upon tradition alone. In a word, we have the all-important assumption of Protestantism, that Catholics err by preserving to tradition its original virtue, made to rest upon this very tradition! For, we repeat it, it is acknowledged that, by Scripture, its own all-sufficiency is nowhere expressly declared.

We affirm, that the method pursued by the reverend professor in this part of his argument, will not bear a strict investigation. In fact, it is by innuendoes, assumptions, and surmises, rather than by close reasoning, that he attempts to engraft his Church’s opinions concerning Scripture, as exclusive dogmatical authority, upon his theory of “primitive tradition.” It is an ill-jointed piece of work: it is new wine in an old bottle, which can ill stand such fellowship. The following is the passage in which the task is performed; we note by *italics* the expressions to which we beg to direct attention.

“On the one hand, *it is no less evident*, that Scripture, being once ascertained, became, in its turn, a test for every thing claiming to be of apostolical tradition. But on this part of the subject *there is less occasion to dwell, it being, I suppose, allowed on all hands.* . . . . The character which our article justly assigns to the Bible, of so ‘containing all things necessary to salvation, that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation,’—this character the Bible could not, from the very force of the terms, acquire, until a sufficient portion of its contents had appeared, to include in one place or another, every one of such fundamentals. *Nor are we sure* of this condition having been fulfilled, until the appearance of St. John’s gospel and epistle. This consideration *may serve to account* for the comparative rareness of quotations from the New Testament, in the writings of the first century.”

Here follow some proofs of this scarcity, and of the appearance of more frequent appeals to Scripture in Tertullian and St. Irenæus; after which the author continues:

“*From all this I gather*, that in the interval . . . . the canon of the New Testament had first been fixed and notorious, and that the fact had been observed which is stated in our article . . . . that every fundamental point of doctrine is contained in the unquestioned books of that canon, taken along with the Hebrew Scriptures. And this observation *being once made, would of course immediately suggest* that golden rule, not of the Anglican only, but of the Catholic Church, that nothing is to be insisted on as a point of faith, &c. *At any rate it is unquestionable*, that by the time of Irenæus, *i. e.* towards the

end of the second century, the fact had been universally recognised, and the maxim thoroughly grounded and incorporated into the system of the Catholic Church."\*—p. 28-31.

If the Church of England is willing that this should stand for its demonstration of its Article, on the exclusive dogmatical authority of Scripture, we heartily congratulate it on the state of its foundations. Let the argument be inculcated in church and school, let it be urged upon the laity, and recommended to the clergy; and we Catholics may fold up our arms, and patiently wait its effects. Let it be preached in every Anglican congregation, that originally, for nearly two hundred years, the very rule of faith propounded by us was the only one, the Church being the sole depository of truth, and tradition its only standard; and that these were fully guaranteed by Divine sanction: but, that *we may gather*, from the growing abundance of scriptural quotation in writers of the second century, that a certain fact (which, be it remarked, is by them nowhere recorded or alluded to) had been observed, to wit, that Scripture contained all the essential doctrines of religion;—farther, that *such an observation being made*,—of which there is no evidence,—*would of course suggest* the golden rule of the 20th Article;—finally, that the result would be a transfer of the dogmatical deposit from divinely-sanctioned tradition to Scripture, which nowhere declares itself all-sufficient,—which transfer takes place about the time of St. Irenæus, though no ecclesiastical act or declaration, no historical record, no voice of attesting witnesses, has preserved a note of such an important revolution! Grant all this—grant our rule two centuries of undisturbed, authorized possession, and then we may safely allow such a tissue of unsupported assumptions and conjectures to deprive it of its rights—if they can!

With the third division of Professor Keble's sermon we deal not; it is time for us to return to the declarations of the BRITISH CRITIC.

In looking over the theory of Church authority, set forth in the pas-

---

\* In a note on this passage (F. p. 60), the author develops his appeal to St. Irenæus. First, he quotes a passage which speaks only of two ways of studying Scripture, but applies in no way to dogmatical teaching, or the grounds of faith. He then refers to the well-known passage of St. Irenæus, given by himself in the sermon. (p. 24.) St. Irenæus asks: "What if the Apostles had left us no Scriptures?" &c.; upon which Professor Keble thus reasons: "The mere question, If we had not the Scriptures, must we not follow tradition? implies that, having the Scriptures, we have the substance of truth, necessary to salvation, and, so far, depend not at all on tradition." Perhaps it might have been so, had St. Irenæus shewn that he meant to draw this consequence, and not exactly the contrary. For he puts the question in order to prove that "it is easy to receive truth *from the Church*,"—not from Scripture; and that, even in his time, "whoever willed might receive from her the waters of life, since therein, as in a rich depository, the Apostles did most abundantly lodge all things appertaining to truth." (p. 24.) Surely this does not prove that St. Irenæus imagined the Scripture to have impaired the Church's rights as the depository of truth. It can hardly be considered fair to draw an inference from a writer's words, as though he had not himself done it; it can be still less fair to draw one exactly at variance with the one he draws. Nor, after all, could Mr. Keble's argument be, under any circumstances, correct, for St. Irenæus says nothing at all about "the substance of truth necessary to salvation;" and if his words prove the substitution of Scripture for Church authority, there is nothing to restrict them to this one object, but they would imply the complete abrogation of *all* traditional teaching, which it is not the professor's desire to admit. He had no right to introduce any such restriction, and the context gives no sanction to it. St. Irenæus is the only Father whom he quotes.

sages which, higher up, we wove together from the *British Critic*, and which indeed on many other occasions are proclaimed by that journal and its friends, two things particularly strike us; *first*, the attempt which they make to palm their peculiar and unauthorized sentiments upon the Anglican Church; and *secondly*, the utter inconsistency and fallacy of the scheme of Church authority which they claim in its behalf. We will offer a few obvious remarks upon these two points.

I. Before the present inquiry can be satisfactorily solved, it is necessary to have some criterion, by which the avowed principles of a religion can be known, in contradistinction to the opinions tolerated within its pale. Now we apprehend that the fairest and surest test is universality of consent or diversity of opinion in teaching, concerning it. If the symbolical documents of a Church, that is, its avowed definitions, or authorized expositions of faith, decide, or seem to decide a belief, and the great body of its pastors or teachers agree in one interpretation of that definition, and allow none other to be taught, that we hold to be the doctrine of that Church. If it allow two most different, or even contradictory sentiments, to be publicly taught, the holders of neither have a right to call theirs more than opinions in the Church. We can illustrate this rule either from the Catholic or from the Anglican Church.

The Catholic Church holds a dogma often proclaimed, that in defining matters of faith she is infallible. No one would be allowed by her to teach any other doctrine; whoever does, ceases practically to be Catholic; and if he be a pastor, and prove obstinate in his error, must be removed from his office. At the same time, while all agree that this infallibility resides in the unanimous suffrage of the Church, whether united in council or dispersed over the world, the Italian doctrine extends it to the plenitude of authority residing in its Head, and makes his dogmatical decrees of force antecedently to the expressed consent, or implied acquiescence, of the other pastors. The Gallican denies this, and maintains that time must be given for the Church to assent or dissent: and only in the former case considers the decree binding. Practically, as experience has proved, either opinion leads to the same results; but manifestly the assertors of neither can demand that their peculiar theory be received by others as the defined or acknowledged principles of the Church, neither think we that they could reasonably charge with "misunderstanding their Church's doctrines," such as would not so receive it. But let us take an example from the English Church.

Her 22nd article "at one fell swoop" pounces upon purgatory, indulgences, veneration of images and relics, and invocation of saints, and utterly condemns them all, most irremissibly. The 30th article asserts the use of the cup to be of equal importance, by divine institution, with the receiving of the other element in the Lord's Supper. The 28th, that transubstantiation is opposed to God's word. Few articles probably are subscribed with greater unanimity and heartiness, by churchmen, than these; never have we heard of a single bold spirit among them flying in the face of their letter, and presuming to deliver in church a word in favour of what these condemn. Were any one of them to preach on the existence of purgatory, or the right of administering the Eucharist under the form of bread alone, we have no doubt but his diocesan would soon reprove him, and should he turn out obstinate, remove him from his situ-

ation. The contrary opinions then to these points are articles of belief of the Anglican Church, on which no difference of opinion is tolerated in any of her ministers. But take on the other hand justification, election, and predestination, and you will find them, according as they belong to the evangelical or high-church "connexion," holding and teaching the most conflicting doctrines, to neighbouring flocks, without being removed, or even chid for either set of opinions, which they may have chosen to embrace. It is true that the former points are but as "mint and cummin" compared to these "weightier things of the law:" but it is no less true that the Church of England allows a latitude of doctrine respecting these, which forbids us to admit the holders of either opinion as exclusively in possession of its declared sentiments. In like manner, *supposing* that Church to have defined that it "hath authority in matters of faith," and yet to allow the public teaching of two opinions within its bosom, by its legitimate ministers, one to the extent of the *British Critic's* assertions, the other to the extent of a total denial of them; we must, even in charity as in good sense, refer this matter to those on which diversity of opinion is tolerated, and refuse to accept either as the doctrine of the Church. Each can pretend only to be a doctrine taught *within* it.

There are two ways of ascertaining this variety of opinions, upon this, as upon any other point; by the examination of living teachers, and by the appeal to more ancient testimonies. We are willing to take either test.

But wherefore any need of proof, when, to use the *Critic's* expression, we have *confitentem reum*? In p. 384, he finds it necessary to explain his denial that the Bible alone is admitted by the Anglican Church as the rule of faith. "Now let us understand here," so he writes, "we know full well that this is a popular mode of speaking at this day; we know well it is an opinion *in* our Church; but it is by no means universally received, much less a principle." This reserve and caution of expression, for which we give the journal sincere credit, this serious protestantism that the opinion contrary to its own is *not* universal, this acknowledgment that nevertheless it is "popular," is more than sufficient to prove that its own theory is not that of the Church, but one among conflicting systems permitted to live and contend, and yet nestle together in her easy bosom.

We may, perhaps, be reproached by our readers, for extending this argument to such a length; if so, they must kindly bear with us a few moments more, while we discuss the appeal made from living witnesses to the illustrious dead. The *British Critic* indeed discards the Hornes, the Tottenhams, and others; but it refers the question of Church authority to the Bulls, the Beveridges, the Lauds, the Jewels, and a few other ancient divines. They, at least, prove, by their testimony, that the Church maintains its claim to dogmatical authority. It takes the trouble of making considerable extracts from their works.

We do not deny that on many occasions they seem to speak a language eminently Catholic: but we say no less that they stood in their generation as the Oxford knot do at present, as men of one way of thinking, amidst as many or more, who maintained a different or even contradictory opinion. Laud was considered by many in the Church as little better than "a papist," and was suspected, whether truly we do not pretend to say, of hankering after the institutions, and dallying with the proffered

dignities, of the Roman Church. Certain it is, that upon the Episcopal Bench of his time were found some to treat with the Papal agents about a reconciliation with the Holy Sec.\* Many other Anglican divines, the fear of the "Geneva discipline," and Presbyterian or Socinian opinions, drove to take shelter in tradition, and to claim rights for their Church, upon the authority of antiquity. At any rate, before we can admit these writers to be urged against us, as representatives of the true Anglican doctrine, we must be satisfied that the body of that Church considers them such. Of this we have as yet no proof.

Let Anglicans themselves clear up these points, and decide—first, *wh* are their acknowledged theological authorities, and then *what* these teach, and we may allow them to charge us with unfairness for not drawing our statements exclusively from them. The *British Critic* is, indeed, hard to please upon these matters. If Dr. Wiseman quotes Baxter, who has received the commendations of Barrow, Wilkins, and other Anglican divines, or Jones, whom Dr. Maltby has praised,† it is an insult to Beveridge to place him in such company. (p. 392.) If Dr. Beveridge himself is cited, it happens to be a work written by him when a young man, and not published by himself. (p. 390.) As to the latter circumstance, people very seldom *do* publish their own "Private Thoughts," but rather leave them to be given after their deaths; and as to his age, we might allow the plea in matters of research or thought, but scarcely in treating of an acquaintance with the principle of faith held in one's own Church. Certes, St. Thomas Aquinas was not much, if at all, older, when he composed many of his treatises; yet we do not think that either Catholic or Protestant looks to the chronology of his works, when he quotes him as a testimony of what his Church teaches and taught. And surely, that cannot be very clearly the principle of faith of the Anglican Church, which Beveridge, about to take orders, did not know to be such, and only discovered by maturer studies.

Let that Church, *as a Church*, detach itself from all other sectaries in its reasoning against us, let it avow disapprobation of their principles, let it be as unanimous in its doctrines concerning tradition and Church authority—we will not say as we are, but as it is itself on the rejection of Transubstantiation, and then we will acknowledge its right to record a separate plea from the great body of Protestants, when the Catholic arraigns them together for a breach of religious unity.

From Bailly's‡ to Milner's "End of Religious Controversy," from Jewel's "Apology" to Burgess's "Charges," we meet no traces of this distinction between Anglican and Ultra-Protestant. The line of demarcation is clear and bold; "the Bible alone" on one side, "Church authority" on the other, defines the challenge of the combatants; the Protestant never haggles about the terms, the Catholic never flinches from his ground. "With this sword" (Scripture) says Jewel, "did Christ put off the devil, when he was tempted of him; with these weapons ought all presumption which doth advance itself against God to be overthrown and conquered. 'For all scripture,' saith St. Paul, 'that cometh by the

\* As Bishop Montague.

† The Clarendon press, at which Jones's work was printed, is under the direction of persons appointed by the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University.

‡ "An End to Controversy." Downy, 1654.

inspiration of God, is profitable,' &c. Thus did the Holy Fathers always fight against the heretics, with none other force than with the Holy Scriptures.\* Harding understands these words in the usual "popular" sense of the rejection of all *authority* but Scripture, and refutes them accordingly. Nor, if we remember right, does Jewel complain of misrepresentation. If he appeals to the Fathers, it is more as a question of fact than of right; he wishes to show that they are with Protestants and not with Catholics; but he does not allow them as judges or umpires between the two.

But, after all, religion is a practical, and not merely a speculative, institution; and we think that the doctrines of a Church may best be learned from what its pastors generally teach, and its followers generally believe. And on this view, we are satisfied, that the Church of England, as it exists at present, must be enumerated under the general head of Protestantism, and cannot be placed in a distinct class. But its article, which declares that "the Church hath authority in matters of faith?"—to it we oppose, *first*, the doubtfulness of its authenticity, or rather the strong probability of its spuriousness, whereof *we* are nearly convinced. *Secondly*, the latitude of interpretation which we have already seen permitted in the Church, and which allows the Ultra-Protestant principle of private judgment to be publicly taught by its authorised ministers. *Thirdly*, the difficulties of the system to which it leads, as explained by the *British Critic*—difficulties which will not allow dogmatical authority to be the principle of the Anglican Church.

II. This last objection forms, if our readers remember, the second head of our general animadversions upon the system presented by the periodical organ of the High Church party. Our first exception to it arises from its evident obscurity, in the mind of its expositor himself. Take the two following passages:

"Will he (Dr. W.) reply, that the Roman church does *not* grant that it can decree things *contrary* to the scripture? True, but it claims to decree points of faith *beyond* scripture. And this is the authority which we deny it." p. 378. \* \* \* \* \*

"We consider that her (the Church's) decision in such extra-scriptural matters is not secure from error; is entitled, indeed, to veneration, but has not, strictly speaking, *authority*, and therefore may not rightly be *enforced*. This distinction is made at the end of the twentieth Article:—'As it (the Church) ought not to *decree* anything against the same, so *besides* the same ought it not to *enforce* anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.' The Church must not enforce beyond scripture; *it may decree*, i. e. *pronounce beyond it, but not against it*."—p. 379.

And yet in the same breath we have been told, that this is the very authority which is denied to the Catholic Church. The writer would, perhaps, reply, that it is the *authority* which is denied to us, and is not claimed by the Anglican Church. But, to a simple, unsophisticated

---

\* On the contrary, Professor Keble writes as follows:—"As often as Tertullian and Irenæus have false teachers to reprove, or unevangelical corruptions to expose, do they not refer to the traditions of the whole Church, as to something independent of the written word, and sufficient, at that time, to confute heresy, even alone? Do they not employ Church tradition as parallel to Scripture, not as derived from it?"—Sermon, p. 23.

reader, such a distinction will hardly occur; and we confess that we read over the paragraph repeatedly, with the conviction, that its termination flatly contradicted its beginning. And even now it leaves upon our mind the conviction, that the writer has not very clear notions of what he should deny to the Catholic Church, and what he should claim for his own.

Nor is this perplexity imaginary. The Church may *decree*, but it may not *enforce*. What if its decrees be disregarded? What, if men, as did the Presbyterians under Elizabeth and James, overlooking the distinction, pronounce that to be contrary to Scripture which the Church decrees as only beyond it? Must it stop short? Is it powerless in *enforcing* the observance of its injunctions? If so, then is that reasoning not unjust, of which the *Critic* so loudly complains, that "each one has to judge for himself, whether the Church be contradicting the express doctrines of Scripture; and that, consequently, each person is thus constituted judge over the decisions of his Church."\* Has the Church the right of enforcing upon the individuals? Then is the *Critic's* distinction futile and vain.

In fact, the idea of a Church, or any other governing authority, possessed of a power to *decree* more extensive than its power to *enforce*, is self-repugnant. It may *recommend* or exhort to an extent beyond its authority to put in execution; but it must not talk of enacting or *decreeing*.

This obscurity of the system may be further evinced from the heaviness of the commentary which overclouds the simplicity of the text. The article, if genuine, simply says, that "the Church hath authority in controversies of faith." This is vague enough, heaven knows; and gives little scope for practical inferences, but abundant for theories. Professor Keble engrafts upon it all his doctrine of tradition, and the threefold order of truths to be derived from it, and the necessity of studying diligently the writings of the Fathers. The *British Critic* builds upon it a more massive theory of the Anglican Church's referring "the ultimate infallible decision in matters of saving faith to antiquity, giving authority to the Church, as being the witness and voice, or rather the very presence of antiquity amongst us." (p. 384.) This "limitation," or rather amplification, of the article, is to be drawn from one of the Canons of Convocation. (p. 379.) Be it so; but the Canon would have done well to tell us, when, where, and by whom, this appeal to antiquity, or rather this summons of attention, to its yet speaking voice is to be made: the *Critic* might have shown us how the Church makes it at the present day, in order to the confutation and overthrow of those rampant errors which have long torn her in pieces.

For, this we think a still weightier objection to the system, that it is theory, and nothing but theory. It has no life, no vigour, no active existence. We may weary our readers by insisting so often upon this idea; but it is one never to be lost sight of, in controversy with this party. The Church which they describe, and which they idolize, is imaginary and exists only upon paper. Perhaps in its beginning it may have exhibited its vital powers, by stoutly combating, and, with the aid of the secular arm, repressing, the innovations of seceders from its pale;

out long has it given proof that such a vigour was external and adventitious, depending upon the interest which the State felt in its exercise of influence. Since it has been left to itself, although within it and around it, through dissension and dissent, its articles have been impugned, its discipline decried, its usefulness disputed, its ministrations contemned: no voice of authority has been raised within it, no outstretching of its arm has been witnessed; never once has it assumed that attribute of dignity, that imposing mien of command, which the imagined depository of an apostolic teaching, and an establishment of heaven-guided ministers, might be supposed entitled to assume.

Has it been so with the Catholic Church? Was Jansenism, not half so perilous or so pernicious as Arianism, allowed by wily arts to seduce the faithful, while no one spoke? On the contrary, although but little more than a century before the Church had lost a large portion of her dominion, through the unhappy Reformation, and she seemed ill able to afford another defection, she did not hesitate to trace out the hidden error, and cut away, with steady hand, the cancer which had stretched its subtle roots through a part of her otherwise healthy frame. It was an operation, indeed, more painful and more difficult, than the previous cutting off of a useless and diseased limb; but she shrank not from the performance of her stern duty. Though the sectaries were anxious not to break communion with the Universal Church, though they successively retreated from plea to plea, the Holy See, supported by the Bishops of the Catholic world, tore off every disguise under which they sought to lurk, and overthrew every pretence for resistance, till the evil was removed, and without loss to the Church clean destroyed. When attempts were made by Ricci and the Pistoians, to revive in Italy what had been foiled in France, Pius VI, by his noble constitution *Auctorem Fidei*, vindicated the dignity of the Apostolic See, and united the suffrages of the whole Church in their condemnation. And that condemnation was the destruction of the dangerous novelty.

Such are, indeed, practical and vigorous proofs, not merely of a system of authoritative teaching in the Church, but of its healthy action. And such was the method pursued in that antiquity, which we are told yet raises its voice in the Anglican Church. For it was not then deemed sufficient to frame a symbol or code of articles, and then leave it to its fate, and pursue the detection and repression of error no further; but every new heresy was met by a new remedy, every poisonous invention led to the publication of a new antidote; and singly was each starting error beaten down, and in general effectually. Nay, the symbols of the Church were never mere "articles for the avoiding of diversities of opinion;" they were not acts for settling the basis of belief and government, but they were occasional exercises of authority called forth by the rise of new and unheard-of opinions. Even in the case of national Churches, the same, in a subordinate degree, was their practice. The Donatists of Africa were energetically attacked and condemned, in the first instance, by the authoritative decisions of the Church in that country. If then Anglicanism holds the same principles, why does it not, as well as Catholicism, continue to act upon the same system? God knows that it cannot have been from want of opportunity or necessity. Authority is an active instrument; it requires exercise for its maintenance; it is as a bow, which, if for ages left unstrung, will snap whenever the attempt be



made again to bend it. If the English Church have all along believed herself possessed of so rich a deposit as this apostolic power to teach, how will she answer for having folded it up in a napkin, and buried it so long in the earth? If not, whence has a new light burst upon her now, or upon some of her divines, and convinced them she has always possessed the treasure?

How comes it, too, that never in her articles is allusion made to the manner of exercising this authority, or to the places or circumstances under which the exercise should be made? We should rejoice, indeed, by way of experiment to see such a trial made as the *Critic* somewhere proposes, of an Anglican national synod. We should like to see the Church condemn Calvinistic and Semi-Arian principles, and deprive all ministers who teach them; endeavour to introduce the practices commended in the Oxford "Tracts for the Times;" order such a reformation as would restore the cathedral service to its original forms, binding the wealthy canons to residence, and cutting down pluralities; then openly denounce, with the *Critic*, Wesley as "a heresiarch," and consequently his followers as heretics, and boldly pronounce that anathema of the Church, which the Review now mutters against such as believe and profess not, in accordance with the Anathasian Creed. Let all this, we say, be done by a national Council of the Anglican Church; and let its decrees be based upon "primitive tradition, as well as Scripture, and her authority claimed as a rightful inheritance ever held by her since apostolic times;" and then we shall indeed see, whether her own children will justify her wisdom, or whether the attempted blow will not be rather considered as the "telum imbellis sine ictu,"\* of one who sinks in venerable dotage at the foot of his vanquished domestic altar.

But the practical inutility of this speculative system of authority is far from ending here. Whoever claims a right to control others, whether in judgment or in action, must offer at least some advantage in return. The Protestant has an obvious right to ask the ministers of the Anglican Church, "If I surrender my opinions and reasonings into your hands, if I abandon my conventicle and embrace your formularies of worship, what certainty have I gained that I am securer of the truth than I was before?" Now the answer, if honest and explicit, should, according to the principles of the *British Critic*, be as follows: "The Anglican Church is a part of the true Church; it is a national independent branch thereof. She pretends not, however, even collectively, to immunity from error. For it is one of her articles, that 'as the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred,' and as 'also the Church of Rome hath erred . . . in matters of faith,'† so the Anglican, which pretends to no more infallibility than she allows to them, may err no less in matters of faith. But then this immense advantage will result from your joining the national Church, that though it, as a particular Church, may fail, and teach what is erroneous in faith, yet 'the whole Church all over the world will never agree in teaching and enforcing what is not true.'"

Now, we ask any unprejudiced mind, whether this is not like toying with men's consciences and good-sense at once? In fact, we have not gone far enough in the concessions of this imaginary, but consistent, answer. For some Anglican divines hold the Church to be of a revolutionary character—not in the political, but in the scientific, sense

\* *Æneid*. ii. 544.

† *Art.* xix.

‡ *British Critic*, p. 380.

of the word—moveable, like the Jewish tabernacle, from one place to another; and England is allowed by them to have had her turn, and to be probably on the point of losing it. Thus writes Dr. Daubeny; though we cannot be sure that he is on the *Critic's* list of the orthodox, and whether we may not be charged with unfairness in presuming to quote him, as an authority in the Church, whose champion he stands forth:—"Though this Church, from the days of its first settlement, hath been passing from country to country, as the inhabitants of each became respectively unworthy of its longer continuance among them; yet for our comfort we are assured that the gates of hell shall not completely prevail against it. In one part of the world or another, they will be found to the end of time. How long it may be in the counsel of God to continue it in this country He only knows. But the present divided state of Christians, so much lamented by all sound members of the Church, together with that too general indifference for all religious opinions, which, under the fallacious term of *liberality of sentiment*, now prevails, holds out to us no very promising prospect."\* Therefore, not only *may* the Anglican Church fail, but it is highly probable that it *will*. But what matters it to the individual, that the Church all over the world will not concur in teaching error, so long as in this circumstance he has no pledge that the particular branch of it, which he is called upon to join, is secure from failure? Or what claim can the latter establish, by the proof of this universal security, to a particular confidence? Could men be compelled, as a solemn duty, to carry their disputes before any given court of judicature, upon the ground that all the courts throughout the world could not concur in an unjust decision? It is *personal* security, his *own* safety, that each one is bound to seek in matters of faith; and to *exact* submission and obedience in judgment and deed, as a duty strictly binding, where that equivalent professedly is not given, is not only tyrannical but contradictory.

The only way in which this duty of adhesion to an insecure Church, on the ground that the body, whereof it is a corruptible member, is itself incorruptible, can be justified, appears to be this: That the universal Church of Christ, being indefectible, every particular Church which *actually* forms a part of it, must be considered safe; and thus the communion with the fallible becomes a participation in the universal security of the infallible. Such, we suppose to be the reasoning of the Reviewer, when he insists upon the Anglican Church being a branch of the Catholic or universal Church. But where is the proof that the Church of England is in communion with other Churches in the world, excepting its own colonies, and perhaps the Episcopalians of North America? It has no more to say to the Greek, or Armenian, or Syriac Churches, than it has to the French or Italian. There is neither common belief nor common discipline to cement it into unity with them. There is no acknowledgment of communion; there is no interchange of friendly offices, there is no intercourse of epistolary communication. There is no sympathy in distress, no common joy in prosperity, no acquaintance with one another's state and feelings. Take, if it please you, Dr. Isaac Barrow's Utopian "Discourse concerning the Unity of the Church," and apply his enumeration of the duties of this unity, and

see if from them can possibly result that the Anglican Church is in possession of a single link connecting it with the rest of Christ's Church. "If any where any heresy or bad doctrine should arise, all Christians should be ready to declare against it. . . . especially the *pastors of the Churches* are obliged with one consent to oppose it. . . . Thus did the bishops of several Churches meet to suppress the heresy of Pope (*Paul?*) Samosatenus. This was the ground of most synods."\* When has the Anglican Church joined any such confederacy with any other Churches, for the suppression of error or infidelity?

"If any dissension or faction doth arise in any Church, *other Churches*, upon notice thereof, should yield their aid to quench and suppress it." Is there any Church that would, under such circumstances, ask for aid from the Anglican, or accept its proffered assistance?

"All Christians should be ready, when opportunity doth invite, to admit one another to conjunction in offices of piety and charity; in prayer, in *communion of the Eucharist*, &c. St. Polycarp being at Rome, did communicate with Pope Anicetus."† Where is the *Episcopal* Church which would admit an English Protestant bishop to officiate at the altar, or to participate in its Eucharist, knowing him to reject as fond and superstitious so much of its belief and practice?

"If dissension arise between divers Churches, another may interpose to reconcile them; as did the Church of Carthage, between that of Rome and Alexandria. If any bishop were exceedingly negligent in the discharge of his office, to the common danger of truth and piety, his neighbour bishops might admonish him thereto; and if he should not reform, might deprive him of communion." Does the Anglican Church admit in "any neighbour bishops" this right of interference, or does she pretend to it herself, or has she ever thought of using it? Would she expose herself to the certain rebuff she would receive, upon endeavouring to interpose, as a mediatrix, between any two foreign Churches?

"In cases of doubt or difficulty one Church should have recourse to others for advice, and any Church should yield it." Is there any example, or any chance, of such confidence existing between the Anglican or any other Church?

Such are pretty nearly his proofs of unity between different establishments supposed to form collectively "the Catholic Church;"‡ and, therefore, did we call Dr. Barrow's treatise Utopian, because believing, as we suppose, his Church to be one of such establishments, he gravely proposes tests of her pretensions which can only exist in imagination, and must show her to have no pretensions to a real place in this universal community. The Dissenter, then,—for we must be allowed to smile when the *Critic* or Dr. Barrow has the simplicity to call *us* schismatics,—the dissenter is solemnly urged, under grievous peril of his soul, to join the Anglican Church, not because she is safe from error, but because the entire Church is, of which she forms a part. And if he call for proofs that she *is* a part of the Universal Church, characteristics are proposed to him, as criterions of her claim, not one of which exists in her; or rather the absence of which proves that she is *not* in com-

\* Barrow's Works, Tillotson's Ed. vol. i. p. 766.

+ P. 767.

‡ Be it remembered, that the *Critic* approves of Dr. Barrow's conclusion drawn from this very treatise, that Catholics are to be considered as schismatics.—p. 434.

munion with this Universal Church, wherever it is to be found. The unsuccessful tampering of old with the Greek Church, through Cyril Lucaris, will prove, to the scholar, that our commentary upon Dr. Barrow's text has good foundation.

But if a dissenter, thus staggered, not to say shocked, at the boldness of the system which asked so much, and gave him in return so little, were desirous to look about him elsewhere for something of what is here described, he would not be long in discovering a Church, composed of many national Churches, possessed individually of rights and liberties, and forming complete governing communities; but so cemented together in steadfast unity of faith and discipline, as to verify what Dr. Barrow has written of religious unity. In our Church, he would find in practice and in truth, what, spoken of the Anglican Church by one of her own divines, must sound as a cruel jest. The Churches of France and Ireland, of Italy and South America, of Germany and Syria, of Spain and Poland, of Belgium and Cochin China, are in full enjoyment of almost every characteristic\* of religious unity which we have transcribed; the subjects of any one could communicate, the clergy could celebrate at the altar of any other among them. The pastors could meet as brethren, and sit at one council-board; they *do* consult one another in cases of difficulty; they assist and receive one another in distress, and sympathise with their respective sufferings.† But the sects or Churches that are not within this pale—and the Anglican is one—have and can have no participation in these advantages of communion with them, nor do they affect any among themselves. The Patriarch of Constantinople, or the Synod of Moscow, would be greatly astonished if the Convocation consulted them about the Thirty-nine Articles, or if his Grace of Canterbury, travelling in their parts, should ask to read the communion service in one of their churches.

But we are not sure that we should make the insecurity of such as obey the Church of England's summons to join her, end here. For even this imaginary connexion, which she cannot prove, with the Universal Church, ought, according to her principles, to be no guaranty. In her twenty-first Article, she says, that "general councils," that is, assemblies of the bishops of the *whole* Church, "forasmuch as they be an assembly of men whereof all be not governed by the Spirit and Word of God, *may err*, and sometimes *have* erred, even in things appertaining unto God." The Critic, indeed, says, that this Article speaks only "histori-

---

\* We, of course, except such acts of high jurisdiction as no Church now-a-days could pretend to in respect of another, such as the deposition of bishops in another country, &c. Such extraordinary power is only vested in the Sovereign Pontiff. But would the Anglican, under any circumstance, allow the American bishops to interfere in England to such an extent?

† A beautiful example of this truly Catholic feeling has lately taken place. Some of the New States of South America had, during their contest with another country, banished all Spaniards from their territories, not excepting clergymen. Since they have been freed from all alarm, they have zealously set about restoring their religious establishments, and particularly the regular orders. For this purpose, agents, with large sums at their disposal, have been sent to Italy, to procure members of these orders to cross the Atlantic. They have been instructed to give preference to Spaniards who have been ejected from their religious houses by the present Spanish Government. And whenever any of them have sought an asylum in the new States, they have been received with marked kindness and hospitality. Thus has the Catholic spirit triumphed over obstinate national prejudices.

cally of professed and pretended general councils." But, with due deference, we beg to dissent from this interpretation. For though the clause, "and *have* erred," may be only historically added, yet the definition that "they *may* err," is an enunciation of a belief or general principle, inasmuch as it is based upon the circumstance, that all the individuals composing a general council are not guided by the word and spirit of God. Now, as this will apply to every possible general council, as well as to any actual one since that of Jerusalem, we must conclude that the Church of England does not attribute security from error, even to the entire Church of Christ in council assembled. How much less, then, can union with her be an imperative duty, on the ground that thereby the individual is secure through union with the Universal Church?

There is another inconsistency in this new scheme of Church authority. The Church in general is allowed to be indefectible, upon the strength of that text, in which our Saviour promises to be with his apostles to the end of the world (p. 395), and other similar passages. When he says, "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me;" the consequence is, that the Church to which these words are addressed, is at all times to be listened to, as the living voice of Christ; and thus it is indefectible. But, upon these very texts, the High-Church party claim authority for the particular pastors of their Church, as legitimate successors of the Apostles. But how shall these texts, addressed to one only body, be it what it may, confer two perfectly dissimilar things, on two distinct classes of persons, to wit, indefectibility to the collective, universal Church, and authority to each component part thereof? If the Anglican hierarchy lay claim to one of the gifts, they have as much right to the other. But this is not our present question. We ask on what ground are these texts thus made to cut two ways, to answer two different purposes, without any warranty for the distinction in the texts themselves? Whatever Church is declared to be indefectible, is invested with authority, and none other; and as the Anglican Church does not pretend to the one quality, it can have no claim to the other. If the indefectibility which is the consequence of Christ's teaching through the pastors, be not distributable among particular Churches, how is it proved that authority in faith, which is that very teaching, is so distributable? But if the two reside united in the same body, as in consistency they ought, then we say the result is INFALLIBILITY. For indefectibility secures the existence of *objective* truth in the Church at all times; and authority to teach, in conjunction, secures *subjective* truth. In other words, the latter obliges each individual to believe whatever it teaches, while the former assures him that it can never fall into error.

In fact, infallibility is the active manifestation of indefectibility through authority. Where the fund of wisdom and truth is imperishable and incorruptible, its outward communication must be so too. If the Church is to be heard, because Christ teaches in it, the Church is *infallible*,—even as Christ is. All this is in exact harmony with Catholic truth. In this there is no disjunction of what God hath ordained; no drawing of authority for individual Churches, and of indefectibility for the Universal Church from one indivisible text. Both, indeed, are proved; but both in favour of one—of the Catholic Universal Church: and

with these the natural result of the two conjoined—*dogmatical infallibility*. In their pastors, the flock recognise the connecting link between them and this great community; they are ruled and taught by them in strict harmonious unity with the entire Church.

But the Anglican Church can show, as we have already observed, no connexion with any other Church, to prove that it forms a part of any larger religious communion. Either she alone is the Universal Catholic Church, or she is out of its pale. If the first, she should claim indefectibility; if the second, she must renounce authority.

By way of conclusion, let us transfer the inquiry to another country, We were at first inclined to choose Ireland or Italy; but particular exceptions might be taken against both these points of comparison; therefore, we will place the controversy in France. The French Church has a hierarchy, less interrupted in apostolic succession than the Anglican can possibly pretend to be. The Bishops of Gaul may be traced to the second century, or even to the immediate disciples of the apostles; whereas the Anglicans do not pretend to trace their succession further back than the Roman mission under St. Gregory the Great. The succession too in France has no awkward passage to explain in its history, such as the turning out of all the bishops by civil persecution, and tacking to the succession a new set, who pretended to inherit the sees, while they rejected the religion of those before them. But putting aside all these odious comparisons, we will only assume, that the Church of France has as good a right at least to claim apostolic succession, with all its rights of authority and obedience, as the Church of England. We ask, therefore, are not the French Protestants chargeable with schism, since they “separate themselves from the Church, and make congregations contrary to their canonical bishops?” (p. 435.) Are they not “bound,” as much as, according to the *Critic*, the English Catholics are, “to unite themselves to the French Church?” (p. 434.)

It will not be said that the French Church does not maintain its independence as a national Church, or that by its submission to the Supremacy of the Holy See, she has forfeited her rights over all separatists within her dominions. For Barrow expressly says: “Yet those Churches, which by voluntary consent or command of princes, do adhere in confederation to the Roman Church, we are not, merely upon that score, to condemn or reject from the communion of charity or peace, for in that they do but use their liberty.”\* Now the French Church is not bound certainly by any compulsion to the Roman See; and, therefore, the French Protestants cannot refuse it obedience on this score. But then, perhaps, the French Church “maintains impious errors,” or “prescribes naughty practices,”—which the learned doctor adds as a sufficient reason for treating a Church as “heretical or schismatical.” And who is to pronounce this judgment for the French Protestant? He himself individually? Then we have private judgment set up against and above the decision of the national Church; and thus is the Dissenter's plea made good against the Anglican Church. The body of Christians to which he is attached? Then must similar bodies in England have the same right: and Catholics cannot be

schismatics who use this right, and proclaim the Anglican Church to teach "impious errors," and therefore to be itself "heretical and schismatical." Some foreign Church, as the Anglican? Then may the English Catholic be equally guided by the decisions of her more numerous foreign Churches. And, moreover, according to the theory of independent national Churches, each has a right to command full obedience from its own immediate subjects free from foreign controul. But, says the *Critic*, "The Romish Church generally is regarded as schismatical, in exacting, as terms of communion and articles of faith, doctrines which are of uncertain authority (p. 435). By whom is it so generally regarded? By the Anglican Church! And is this then an infallible Church, which has a right to set up its decision against the combined decisions of so many other certainly *no less* apostolic Churches, which concur in not considering those articles as of uncertain authority, and in condemning the Anglican as heretical? Or are Protestants in Catholic countries bound to recognize in her an authority to rule their belief against the decisions of the hierarchy in them, while the Catholics or Dissenters in England have no similar resource in any other country? If so, the Anglican Church comes within the gripe of Barrow's conclusion,—that if Churches be "turbulent and violent, trying by all means to *subdue and enslave other Churches* to their will or their dictates; in such cases we may reject such Churches as heretical and schismatical, or wickedly uncharitable and unjust in their proceedings."

One of two things. Either it must be left to the individual to decide whether a Church proposes or not "doctrines of uncertain authority," and then his private reason is constituted superior to the Church, and a judge over her decision; or else the decision of any foreign Episcopal Church has as much right to controul the individual judgment of each person, and then Protestants in Catholic countries are acknowledged to be heretics. In the first supposition, Dissenters are not heretics or schismatics with regard to the Established Church; in the second, the French Protestants are bound to subscribe to their belief in Purgatory and Transubstantiation, which the Anglican Articles condemn. In either, the writer in the *Critic* has, we imagine, a hard alternative. To use his own words, "we differ from him in logic, as much as in divinity." (p. 397.)

Let us place the question under another aspect. These High-Church divines say, that their Church draws its explanations of Scripture from antiquity, of which it is the witness and depository. It builds therefore upon this testimony its belief in the Eucharist, and its interpretation of the words employed by our Lord in its institution. But the Catholic Church, that is, the union of many other Churches, appeals to precisely the same authority and test for its interpretation and belief. This is not a question of first principle, as whether any thing is to be enforced or not, which is not clearly proved from Scripture: it is a matter of application of a rule equally admitted. The Zwinglian maintains the Eucharist to be a naked symbol, a merely commemorative rite. The Catholic and the Anglican contradict him; the former says that tradition has ever taught in his Church, a real and corporeal presence of Christ in that sacrament: the Anglican that his Church has learned from the same source to believe in a *real* but not a *corporeal*.

presence. Who is to decide between the two? Is it the duty of the individual to unravel the mystery for himself, and trace out the testimony of tradition through the first ages? Then private judgment again comes in, and again is exalted as the umpire between conflicting Churches! Shall the Anglican Church have the preference? But she renounces all claim to infallibility. And what other plea can she urge which shall not assume her being the only true Church, and her principle of faith being the only correct one,—which is the very matter of inquiry?

The fact is, that there is no middle point between private judgment and the infallible authority of a living Church, which, being universal, can command particular Churches as well as individuals. We would willingly exclude the name of Mr. Blanco White from our pages, but he seems to us at this moment to be a “sign,” though not a “wonder,”—a monumental record of this principle, practically illustrated in his double apostasy. He seems to us to have satisfactorily demonstrated, that on the march from Catholicity to Socinianism, and the unlimited use of private judgment, the Church of England presents no resting-place. It may indeed be passed through on the road, and its curious imitations of the place just left may detain the wanderer’s and outcast’s attention for a brief space, as it did Mr. White’s; but on he must go, if he be borne forward by a consistent principle, till he reach the other extreme.\*

Many observations which have come before our minds we have been compelled to omit, for really there is no end to the incoherences and impracticabilities of the High-Church scheme. It presents one inextricable confusion of rights belonging to the Universal Church with those of particular parts or national establishments. The Church is ever spoken of as indefectible—as the depository of truth—the voice of antiquity,—and all this is said of the Universal Church. But when we come to the deference due to it in consequence of these prerogatives, by a process of logical jugglery, the Anglican contrives to step in to receive it as its right. If these divines would keep the two distinct in their argument, they would find it miserably lame.

We were not a little surprised to see the vulgar misstatement repeated in the *Critic’s* pages, that Catholics believe their Church empowered to *create* articles of faith (p. 383). They claim for her no more of authority than she exercised in the early ages, that of defining what had been believed within her from the beginning, and thus *declaring* articles of faith. The symbols of the ancient councils, as we have before observed, were only framed against heresies as they rose; and certain points were thus defined and proposed, for the first time, in clear formal terms, to the acceptance of the faithful. Other matters, such as the Eucharist, grace, justification, were omitted, because on them there was no error. Had any existed, the doctrine regarding them would have been as clearly laid down. And there can be no doubt but that a new obligation would thus have fallen upon all Christians, to believe definitively with the Church, on points whereon, before the definition, they could not be so well instructed, nor so accurately know the faith of the Church dispersed. Hence it is not an uncommon

\* See his “Observations on Heresy and Orthodoxy,” p. 7.



remark of judicious and primitive writers, that the Fathers spoke more loosely upon certain subjects, before they had been clearly defined by the Church. If this declaration of matters, ever believed, but not before defined, be called a *creation* of new articles, we have no objection to the *Critic's* phrase. But if by this term is signified, that, according to Catholics, their Church may propose that to be believed which before was not believed, it is a gross perversion of truth to apply it to us.

In fact, we believe the Church, in regard to her authority, to have no past and no future. She is always one; and whatever she had ever a right to do, after the Apostles' time, she has a right to do at present. When the *Critic*, or Mr. Keble, sends us back to antiquity as the rule of faith, joined to Scripture, and thereby means the doctrine of the three or four first centuries, we beg to remind him, that these times were once *the present* of the Church. The faithful of those days did not, could not, look to "antiquity," which then was not, but to the *living* Church. What was their rule of faith is ours; three hundred years, or eighteen hundred, from the time of Christ, cannot make a difference in a principle; it was nowhere appointed, or decreed, or foretold, that for so many centuries the *existing* Church should teach, and that, after that time, she should lose her authority, and be only the witness to antiquity. Yet so much must the *Critic* pretend, by boasting that the Catholic "gives to the existing Church the ultimate infallible decision in matters of saving faith . . . and the Anglican to antiquity, giving authority to the Church as being the witness and voice . . . of antiquity." What that antiquity held, we hold, for it could not acknowledge any authority but the *existing* Church.

Moreover, the High Church principle only removes the difficulties of Protestantism, or as these divines prefer calling it, of *ultra-Protestantism*, another step; but it does not obviate them completely. Antiquity, as deposited in the writings of the early ages, is a dead letter as much as the Bible: it requires a living interpreter no less. It has its obscurities, its perplexities, its apparent contradictions as much; it requires a guide no less to conduct us through its mazes. It cannot step in and decide between conflicting opinions and rival claims; it can, at most, be a code which requires a judge to apply it. It is more voluminous, more complex, more uncompact than Scripture; it needs more some methodizing and harmonizing authoritative expounder. If national Churches can separately fulfil these offices, and sufficiently discharge these duties, they surely ought not to come to contradictory conclusions. Yet the Anglican stands in stark opposition to every other Episcopal Church throughout the world;—its own daughter in America perhaps excepted.

And yet narrow as are the limits of this Church, its principle of faith has not secured to it the blessing which should be its destined result, a steadfast unity of belief among its members. We speak not merely of the prevalence of dissent, but of the vast differences which the controversies, treated of in this article, have shown to exist between the members of the Anglican Church. The *British Critic* proposes a synod of that Church, as the best means of settling its present difficulties. Once more we say; let it be called, and we shall see how the Kebles and the Russells, the Newmans and the Arnolds, the Puseys

and the Bickersteths, will agree in defining the first principle of faith, the ground on which all other controversies should be decided.

At the same time, comprehensive, nay, vast as is the pale of Catholicity, and embracing, as it does, every zone, and every quarter of the globe, let a council be called of its pastors, and you would see how differently *its* rule has attained the end of its existence, in the universal harmony it has produced in belief and practice. There you might interrogate a bishop from New Spain, or a Vicar Apostolic from Sweden, a professor of the Sorbonne, or a country curate from the Abruzzi: you might consult the catechism taught to the child in Ireland, or to the native convert in the Philippine Islands, without discovering any wavering or hesitation on the question of Church authority, or any doctrine by it defined.

And by this comparison, it may be seen how in the Catholic Church the manifestation of the Son of Man, the living Word of the Father, is "as the lightning which cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west," one single, indivisible and unsearchable blaze of light, pervading the entire heaven of human intelligence from hemisphere to hemisphere. But if, on the one hand, when we are told, "Lo! He is in the desert," in camp-meetings and field-preachings and revivals, amidst the mad exuberance of ultra-Protestant zeal, "we go not forth;" so, on the other, we hope to be pardoned, if, on being modestly assured that "He is in the secret chambers" of one or two colleges in Oxford, where alone his doctrines may be had in their purity, "we believe it not."\*

There is one point on which we fully agree with the *Critic*, and as it forms the beginning of his article, so shall it form the conclusion of this Tract. In common with many recent writers, he is of opinion that the controversies between our two Churches are only now fairly commencing. He thinks justly, that hitherto we have been assailed "rather by the power of the civil sword than by the arguments of divines." (p. 374.) The privilege of even attacking has been till now all on the other side, and we have been condemned, as a caste, to the ignobler labours of apology and defence. The staff of the oppressor hath now, however, been broken, we stand upon more equal ground, and it is our own fault if we follow not up our advantages. If the battle,—of reason, we mean, and argument,—has now to be fought, we, at least, will not steal away from the field; our habits and feelings would suggest another course, and prompt us, like Tasso's shepherd, to seek seclusion from the war, in the humbler task of our own improvement, or of mere domestic duties. But there are times when every citizen is a soldier, in the spiritual as in civil warfare; and a crisis like this is one. The course which we shall pursue shall be consistent and persevering. We seek not the wealth of our Anglican neighbours, nor their establishment, nor their political power, nor their usurped influence. All these things we esteem as dross. But we covet their brotherhood in the faith, and their participation in our security of belief, and their being bound to us in cords of love, through religious unity. For these things we will contend, unceasingly, and to the utmost of our power; and GOD DEFEND THE RIGHT!

## TRACT N<sup>o</sup>. 3.

*Occasioned by the publication of the "Tracts for the Times."*

---

THE times, Heaven knows, are sufficiently bad. It is a work of charity to try to mend them. The well-known collection of "Tracts for the Times," was published for this purpose. As a well-intentioned attempt, it deserves our sympathy. It is a proof of great zeal, of considerable intrepidity, and of some research. The *Tracts* are the production of a well-known knot of divines at or from Oxford, the determined foes of dissent, the inconsistent adversaries of Catholicity, and the blind admirers of the Anglican Church. In other words, they are written by staunch assertors of High-Church principles.

Will they succeed in their work? I firmly believe they will: nay, strange to say, I hope so. As to patching up, by their prescriptions, the worn-out constitution of the poor old English Church, it is beyond human power. "Curavimus Babylonem et non est sanata," (*Jer. li. 9*) will be their discovery in the end. It is no longer a matter of rafters and partition-walls; the foundations have given way, the main buttresses are rent; and I am not sure but that one who has been, for three centuries, almost deprived of sight, and kept toiling in bondage, not at, but under the grinding wheel, has his hands upon the great pillars that support it, and having roused himself in his strength, may be about to give them a fearful shake. I speak only of moral power, but it is of the immense moral power of Truth.

How, then, will they succeed? Not by their attempts to heal, but by their blows to wound. Their spear may be like that in Grecian fable, which inflicted a gash, but let out an ulcer. They strike boldly and deeply into the very body of dissent, and the morbid humours of Protestantism will be drained out. Let this be done, and Catholic vitality will circulate in their place. They show no mercy to those who venture to break unity in their Church, and like all unmerciful judges, they must expect no mercy. Why did *you* separate from the Roman Church? is a question that every reader of these volumes will ask twenty times. He will find, it is true, what is intended for an answer given him as often: but he will be an easily-satisfied enquirer, if any of these answers prove sufficient for him.

The scope of these *Tracts* seems to be two-fold. First, they endeavour to revive in the Anglican Church a love of ancient principles and practices, by showing on how many points it has departed from them, and how wholesome it would be to return to them. Secondly, they endeavour to place their Church upon the foundation of apostolical succession, enforcing their claims to authority upon the laity, and pressing the clergy to a maintenance of it as a right. Antiquity and authority are their watchwords. They consequently maintain that the English Church has suffered great change during the last century, in having

become too Protestant (*Tr.* 38.) The Fathers of the Reformation, as they are called, are said by them to have kept close to primitive practices, and consequently to have separated less (this they are obliged to own) from the Romish—that is the Catholic Church—than their successors. The Anglican Church, therefore, already stands in need of another reformation, (*Tr.* 38) which shall lead it back to what those Fathers made it. There must have been a sting in this confession. But still it is made boldly—with profession, however, that such an approach to Catholicity, would only be so inasmuch as we have better preserved primitive forms.

The two heads which I have just rehearsed, as embracing the subject-matter of these books, often run into one another, and it is not always easy to separate them. For authority, based upon apostolical succession, is necessarily a part of antiquity, and ancient practices and doctrines are upheld by an appeal to authority. Wishing as I do, to treat of these two matters distinctly, I shall endeavour to examine each upon its own peculiar merits; and perhaps I shall better succeed in keeping them distinct, by making each the subject of a separate Tract. I shall, therefore, confine myself at present to the desire of bringing back the Anglican Church to ancient practices.

The enquiry into this sentiment presents itself to my mind under the form of a very simple question. What was gained by the Reformation, considered as these authors would have it, that is, as a purgation of such malpractices and errors as time had introduced into primitive usages and belief, and a return to the purity of the early ages? Two things should seem to have been necessary to authorise the naming a religious change by such a title. First, all that was really abuse should have been skillfully removed, yet so as to leave all that was ancient and good. If a surgeon, in cutting away a gangrene, cut off a sound limb, he would be said rather to destroy than heal. Secondly, such measures should be taken, as that similar or worse abuses should not again return. If it had required a thousand years to deform the Church, so as to call for a first reformation, this would have proved a sorry work, if, in a couple of hundred more, things had become as bad again. Still worse it would be, if the very Reformation itself had opened a door to similar or worse abuses.

It will be a curious and unexpected result of such mighty convulsions in the religious and political world, as the *Reformation* caused, that the great safeguards of revealed truth should have been pulled down; the stable foundation of divinely appointed regiment in the Church plucked up; rites and ceremonies coeval with christianity abolished; practices come down from the first ages discontinued and discountenanced; and ordinances, believed of old to have been apostolical, abrogated and condemned. And yet all this must be called a “godly work of Reformation,” that same “Reformation” signifying a repristination of primitive christianity! But will it not be stranger to see the old religion, which needed such an operation, preserving all these good things intact, to the jealousy of the Reformed; in such wise, that when this one wished to return to purer or perfecter forms, it must needs seek its models in the other? Shall we upon examination find things so? Let us see.

1. Episcopal authority is justly considered by the Tract-writers as the foundation of Church government. Of its present state in their Church

they write as follows, having quoted passages from St. Clement of Rome, and St. Ignatius martyr.

"With these and other strong passages in apostolical Fathers, how can we permit ourselves in our present *practical* disregard of episcopal authority? Are not we apt to obey only so far as the law obliges us? Do we support the Bishop, and strive to move all along with him as our bond of union and head? Or is not our every-day conduct as if, except with respect to certain periodical forms and customs, we were each independent in his own parish?"—No. 3. p. 8.

"We who believe the Nicene Creed, must acknowledge it a high privilege, that we belong to the Apostolic Church. How is it that so many of us are, almost avowedly, so cold and indifferent in our thoughts of this privilege? . . . Scripture at first sight is express" (in favour of the divine ministerial commission.) . . . "*The primitive Christians read it accordingly: and cherished with all affectionate reverence the privilege which they thought they found there. Why are we so unlike them?*"—No. 4, p. 1.

"I readily allow, that this view of our calling has something in it too high and mysterious to be fully understood by unlearned Christians. But the learned, surely, are just as unequal to it. It is part of that ineffable mystery, called in our creed the communion of saints, &c. . . . Why should we despair of obtaining, in time, an influence far more legitimate, and less dangerously exciting," (than that obtained by the upholders of the holy discipline) "but equally searching and extensive, by the diligent inculcation of our *true* and *Scriptural* claim? For it is obvious that, among other results of the primitive doctrine of the apostolical succession, thoroughly considered and followed up, it would make the relation of pastor and parishioner far more engaging, as well as more awful, than it is usually considered at present."—p. 76.

It is certain that all here desired, existed in the English Church down to the time of the Reformation; it is certain that it exists in all countries that have remained Catholic; it is certain that it exists among those who have clung to the old faith in these islands. What, then, was gained by the Reformation on this score? Had you remained Catholic, you would have had no "practical disregard of episcopal authority," nor would each clergyman have acted "as if independent" of his bishop. Had you remained Catholic, you would have found no difficulty in causing this article of the Nicene Creed to be heartily believed and followed up, nor found yourselves so "unlike the primitive Christians" in your feelings and conduct respecting it. You would have had no need of treating as a matter not desperate, the prospect of one day acquiring the influence over your flocks which unepiscopal teachers have acquired. A reformed, apostolic Church not to *despair* of acquiring an influence which it possessed before it was *reformed*! If, in regard to episcopal authority and its practical influence, the Reformation did no good, did it do any harm? Clearly so. For if this authority was practically lost only after the Reformation, and only where the Reformation was adopted, it must evidently be charged with having caused the practical abandonment of one of the articles of the Nicene Creed, and produced a great dissimilarity between its followers and the primitive Christians. We unreformed have continued to resemble them. How obstinate of us not to embrace the Reformation!

2. The sad effects of this loss of practical authority in the episcopacy, are even more awful than the cause itself. This authority, it is often repeated through these volumes, is not so clearly contained in Scripture as might, *a priori*, have been expected. Men are thus easily led to

reject, or, at least, to despise it. This, of course, they would not, if they laid a proper stress on tradition. The consequence of this departure from traditional teaching, in one respect, leads to a similar departure in more important ones: for instance, regarding the doctrines of the blessed Trinity and the Incarnation. Consider well what follows.

“What shall we say, when we consider that a case of doctrine, necessary doctrine, doctrine the very highest and most sacred, may be produced, where the argument lies as little on the surface of Scripture—where the proof, though *most conclusive*, is as indirect and circuitous as that for episcopacy, viz. the doctrine of the Trinity? Where is this solemn and comfortable mystery formally stated in the Scriptures as we find it in the creeds? Why is it not? Let a man consider whether all the objections which he urges against episcopacy may not be turned against his own belief in the Trinity. It is a happy thing for themselves that men are inconsistent: yet it is miserable to advocate and establish a *principle*, which, not in their own case indeed, but in the case of others who learn it of them, leads to Socinianism. This being considered, can we any longer wonder at the awful fact, that the descendants of Calvin, the first Presbyterian, are at the present day in the number of those who have denied the Lord who bought them?”—No. 45, p. 5.

“For the present, referring to that ineffable mystery (the Incarnation), from which, on this day especially, all our devout thoughts should begin, and in which they should end, I would only ask one question: *What will be the feelings of a Christian, particularly of a Christian pastor, should he find hereafter, that, in slighting or discouraging apostolical claims and views (be the temptation what it may), he has really been helping the evil spirit to unsettle man's faith in the INCARNATION OF THE SON OF GOD?*”—No. 54, p. 12.

These are, indeed, awful consequences of the unsettling of men's minds caused by the Reformation. And they are clearly traceable and imputable to that event. For be the doctrine of Anglicanism what it may, respecting Scripture and tradition, it is evident that in it, as in all Protestant communions, exclusively, could exist this haggling about proofs, because not clear in the written Word. This is manifest; that among Catholics it is not usual for the faithful, still less for pastors, to question, or to “slight, or to discourage, apostolical claims and views;” nor has any one, so far as I know, contended that the dogmas of the Trinity and Incarnation have been perilled amongst us, through insufficient views of Church polity. These, therefore, are peculiar blessings introduced by the godly Reformation. In the English reformed Church a door has been opened to Socinianism, which was close barred before it became reformed, and the unreformed Catholics still contrive to keep well shut. With such confessions, is it strange that we should not be enamoured of the *Reformation*?

3. The constitutional weakness of the body episcopal could not but be followed by the enervation of its right arm. It has long ceased to wield the thunderbolt of ecclesiastical reproof and public censure against incorrigible sinners or open apostates.

“CHURCH REFORM.—All parts of Christendom have much to confess and reform. We have our sins as well as the rest. Oh that *we* would take the lead in the renovation of the Church Catholic on Scripture principles:

“Our greatest sin, perhaps, is the disuse of a ‘godly discipline.’ Let the reader consider—

“1. The command.—‘Put away from yourselves the wicked person.’ ‘A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject.’ ‘Mark them which cause divisions and offences, and avoid them.’

“2. The example, viz. in the primitive Church.—‘The persons or objects of ecclesiastical censure were all such delinquents as fell into great and scandalous crimes after baptism, whether men or women, priests or people, rich or poor, princes or subjects.’—*Bingham, Antiq.* xvi. 3.

“3. The warning.—‘Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.’”—No. 8, p. 4.

Until the Reformation, this godly discipline was in use. Even as yet, in Catholic countries and in our own, ecclesiastical censures are in force, and may be incurred by the violation of the ecclesiastical law. Sometimes they are inflicted by special decree, and are held in the greatest awe by priests and people. I have seen, on the Continent, excommunication taken off before a vast concourse of people, with all the solemn ceremonial of the ancient Church. The king-queller Napoleon felt the power of the Pontiff's arm, and staggered beneath the blow of his excommunication. Not long ago the present Pope pronounced it in general terms against all the participators in an outrage upon his authority; and numbers, conscience-struck, secretly entreated for absolution. The “godly discipline” was lost at and by the godly Reformation: the Church of England went back from “the example of the primitive Church,” when it pretended to return to primitive Christianity: it soon forgot the divine “command” in its eagerness to combat the supposed human commands which it imputed to the Catholic Church. And the latter, which pertinaciously opposed this strange return to primitive Christianity, somehow or other has contrived to keep to this example of the early Church.

4. Another great departure from primitive Christianity, caused by the Reformation, was, according to the Tract-writers, the curtailment of the Church services:—“The services of our Church,” they write, “as they now stand, are but a very small portion of the ancient Christian worship: and, though people now-a-days think them too long, there can be no doubt that the primitive believers would have thought them too short.” (No. 9.) The writer then explains himself farther, by observing that the early Christians taking literally the scriptural intimation of praising God seven times a day, instituted the canonical hours. “Throughout the Churches which used the Latin tongue,” he adds, “the same services were used with very little variation: and in Roman Catholic countries they continue in use, with only a few modern interpolations, even to this day.” (p. 2.) Here, then, is a plain confession. The first Christians, in conformity to Scriptural suggestion, instituted a certain form of prayer, divided into seven portions, and of considerable length. This was in actual use at the time of the Reformation, with very little variation. Well, the restorers of ancient practices, the purgers of all modern abuses, sweep away the whole system: the unyielding Catholics keep hold of it, and possess it till this day. Which was right?—or what good did the Reformation do here?

Towards the end of the paper I have quoted, there are several statements respecting these offices which need emendation. It is pretended that already before the Reformation the offices of the Church had been compressed into two groups, called matins and vespers, and the spirit which had ordered them in their primitive form had been lost. That

consequently, "conscious of the incongruities of primitive forms and modern feelings, the reformers undertook to construct a service more in accordance with the spirit of their age. They adopted the English language; they curtailed the already compressed ritual of the early Christians, &c.

As to the first part of these reflections, I observe, that it is by no means common in religious communities to group the offices together as stated. Matins are generally sung alone, by many orders at midnight, by some over-night, by others early in the morning. Prime is sung at daybreak, and the shorter canonical hours later, with mass interposed; often a solemn mass between every two. Vespers and complin are also performed separately. In collegiate churches, where the canons reside at some distance from the church, the offices are more brought together. It may be said that the writer of the Tract spoke only of the state of things at the Reformation. If so, I have not the means at hand to verify his assertion. But I will take it as well grounded: what follows? Why, that the Catholic Church contrived to correct abuses then existing, without abolishing the ordinances they affected. That she at least knew the difference between destruction and reformation. Why could not Protestants do the same? In their zeal to return to primitive practices, why did they abolish them? Surely the Catholic Church proved that it was not necessary to humour modern feelings, by such sacrifices. Which, then, is the true lover, follower, or restorer of early Christian observances?

On the latter part of our extract I frankly own, that when first I perused it, I was quite mistaken. I fancied that the writer meant to cast some censure on the adoption of the English language, in preference to that uniform speech "which had reversed the curse of Babel." By Dr. Pusey's vindication of the Tracts, I learn that such was not the author's meaning, but that the passage in question was favourable to the change of language. (vol. iii. p. 17.) I think any dispassionate reader would not have so understood it. However, it is plain that if the reformers found it necessary to abridge the services of the Church, in compliance with the spirit of the age, it could not have been the spirit of a *papistical* age, as Dr. Pusey there explains it. For our Church, which he thus designates, has found no need of curtailing, or of farther compression, but rather found means to correct abuses.

But this matter of ancient Church offices lost at the Reformation, is treated more at length in the 75th and following Tracts. In these, the entire office for Sunday, for the dead, and for several festivals, is given by way of specimens. But the introductory sentences to the explanation there premised of these offices, are unmatched in controversial assurance. They are as follow:—

"There is so much of excellence and beauty in the services of the Breviary, that, were it skillfully set before the Protestant by Romanistic controversialists as the book of devotions received in their communion, it would undoubtedly raise a prejudice in their favour, if he were ignorant of the circumstances of the case, and but ordinarily candid and unprejudiced. To meet this danger is one principal object of these pages; in which whatever is good and true in those devotions will be claimed, and on reasonable grounds, for the Church Catholic in opposition to the Roman Church, whose real claim above other Churches is that of having adopted into the service certain additions and



novelties, ascertainable to be such in history, as well as being corruptions doctrinally. In a word, it will be attempted to wrest a weapon out of our adversaries' hands; who have in this, as in many instances, appropriated to themselves a treasure which was our's as much as their's; and then, in our attempt to recover it, accuse us of borrowing what we have but lost through inadvertence."

The only real claim of our Church above other Churches (e. g. the Anglican) consists in having made some addition to the breviary! The having known how to appreciate it, and having kept it, go for nothing. Suppose a case in point.

Two brothers are in joint possession of a noble estate, descended to them from their remote ancestors. The younger, prodigal-like, considers it not worth having, abandons it with contempt, and by public deed, takes instead of it a new paltry patch of uncultivated ground. After 300 years, his descendant comes out, and says to the other's heir, "Sir, I will thank you to understand, that your fine ancestral mansion and broad domains are mine quite as much as yours. It is exceedingly impertinent of you to call your own what once belonged to my family as well as to yours. I claim it 'on reasonable grounds,' for my ancestors lost it 'through inadvertence.' Nothing is yours except certain additional buildings, which it was a great presumption in you to erect." "This is indeed a strange claim," the other might reply; "I was by no means prepared for it. But surely, sir, you will allow that three centuries of undisputed and exclusive possession, and no small labour and expense in cultivating and preserving it, give *some* little superiority of right to the property, over that of former coproprietorship, 'inadvertently' (that means, I suppose, *very foolishly*) cast away, by one who publicly chose a substitute for it?" "None upon earth, my dear sir," the claimant rejoins, "none upon earth, as you must clearly see. It is true that if *you* had not kept it uninterrupted in your family so long, and if your fathers had not bestowed great pains upon it, *I* should not now have known where to put my hands upon it. But that only makes it a matter of greater convenience for *me*; it can give no right to *you*. Now that I choose to have the property again, I shall be extremely obliged to you, if you will no longer call it yours. As for your additional buildings, I shall take them down at the earliest opportunity."

Such is the reasoning which these grave divines pursue, to wrest from us the breviary of which they are jealous. Every single *reformed* country, through "inadvertence," lost this collection of offices. We have never heard of an Anglican, German, Swedish, Danish or Dutch breviary. Had all Europe followed the example of reformation, it is clear that the breviary would have been known only from manuscripts, or a few black-letter editions. Virtually it would have been lost in the Church. Yet it is a service which "seems to have continued more or less, in the same constituent parts, though not in order or system, from apostolic times." (p. 3.) Now, the dear old obstinate Roman Church, could not be brought into the strange inadvertency of reforming itself, by casting away this apostolic institution. She tried another plan. The Council of Trent passed measures for its correction. St. Pius V carried them into effect, and subsequent pontiffs completed the work. Every ecclesiastic in the Catholic Church is bound to the daily recital of

the breviary. In fact, the writer in the Tracts cannot give it any intelligible name but that of the "*Roman breviary*." And yet it is no more ours than theirs, who no longer possess it!

However, we are not disposed to quarrel seriously about our rights on this head. Let it first be restored, and practically enforced, in their Anglican Church. Let us first learn that in all the collegiate churches it is daily sung with the punctuality that it is in those of France or Italy. Let us see published a "*Breviarium Anglicanum ad usum Ecclesie Cantuariensis*," as we have one for St. Peter's Church at Rome, or Notre-Dame in Paris. Let us be informed that each portly dignitary has furnished himself with a Plantinian quarto, and that every curate pockets, on leaving home, a Norwich duodecimo. Put yourselves upon a footing of equality with us in point of *possession*, and it will be quite time enough to discuss the question of *right* to the property.

5. Intimately connected with this matter, which, perhaps, we have too lengthily examined, is another,—the loss of daily service.

"Since the Reformation, the same gradual change in the prevailing notions of prayer, has worked its way silently but generally. The services, as they were left by the Reformers, were, as they had been from the first ages, *daily* services: they are now *weekly* services. Are they not in a fair way to become *monthly*?"—No. 9, p. 3.

If, at the sixteenth century, there was a tendency to shorten and diminish the services, this tendency was completely stopped in all *Catholic* countries, and only went on "working its way" in *Protestant*. Which gained on this score,—those who reformed, or those who refused to do so? Again, the services of the Catholic Church yet remain what they then were, daily services. Every cathedral, collegiate, and generally every conventual, church, all over Catholic christendom, has daily performed in it the divine office, with a numerous attendance of the members who form the chapter or community. Besides this, every church and chapel is open daily to the devotion of the faithful, and the divine Eucharistic sacrifice is daily offered in each. We, therefore, are in no danger of seeing *our* offices become monthly, or even weekly. The *25th Tract* contains an extract from a sermon of Bishop Beveridge, in which this neglect of daily prayer is condemned as a breach of duty. After quoting the rubrics concerning this matter, the bishop thus urges it on the clergy. "But notwithstanding this great care that our Church hath taken to have *daily Prayers* in every parish, we see, by sad experience, they are shamefully neglected, all the kingdom over; there being very few places where they have any Public Prayers upon the week-days, except, perhaps, upon Wednesdays and Fridays; because it is expressly commanded that both Morning and Evening Prayers be read *every day* in the week, as the Litany upon those. And why this commandment should be neglected more than the other, for my part I can see no reason. But I see plain enough that it is a great fault, a plain breach of the known laws of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, and particularly of that part of it which, by his blessing, settled among us." We leave it to the sensible reader to conclude whether the Reformation did good or harm in this part of Christian duty. We will trust him also with the decision, as to which Church has stuck closest to the primitive practice.

6. Besides the performance of daily service, the daily celebration of

the Lord's Supper was appointed at the Reformation, with the practice of daily, and still more, weekly communion. It is allowed, that when the Reformation was introduced, these practices were followed in England. For, another extract from the same bishop, published in the 26th Tract, acknowledges this. "Where we may observe, first, that in those days there was daily communion in cathedral churches, and other places, as there used to be in the primitive Church." (p. 9.) Proof is then given of this practice in St. Paul's. "From whence it is plain, that the communion was then celebrated in that church every day. And so it was even in parish churches." Of which likewise proof is given. The loss of this primitive practice, is called in capital letters, "A SIN OF THE CHURCH," (Tr. 6, p. 4,) that is of the Anglican. For it is the practice solemnly to celebrate the Eucharistic rite, or, as we express it, to say Mass, every day, in every Catholic Church over the world, as it was in England when the Reformation took place. And as this custom is acknowledged to have been primitive and apostolic, we presume it will be granted that, in this respect, as in the preceding, the unreformed have been more successful than the reformed.

7. Let us proceed with rites or practices belonging to this Blessed Sacrament. And first, take a less important one.

"A poor woman mentioned, with much respect, her father's practice never to taste food before receiving the Lord's Supper, adhering unconsciously to the practice of the Church in its better days, and, indeed, of our own in Bishop Taylor's time."—Tr. 66, p. 11.

These better days were the earliest ages. The abuses introduced into the Church of Corinth are groundedly supposed to have led to the practice here mentioned. Tertullian describes the Eucharist as that which was received "*ante omnem cibum*," before every other food. Thus has another primitive observance, held in England till the Reformation, and even continued for some time after, through the impulse of preceding better principles, been completely lost. So much for the efficacy of the Reformation in retaining primitive practices. What shall we say of its ability to return to them? We need not add, that this practice is rigidly followed in the Catholic Church, just as it was "in better days."

8. When the spirit of reformation invaded England, the country was in possession of a liturgy, precisely that which we Catholics now use. On this, let us have the opinion of the Tract-writers. "All liturgies now existing, except those in use in Protestant countries, profess to be derived from very remote antiquity." (No. 63, p. 1.) After this preliminary sentence, the writer proceeds to show, from a comparison of the different liturgies, the justice of their claim. He thus speaks of ours: "Another liturgy, which can be traced back with tolerable certainty to very remote time, is the Roman Missal." Manuscripts are then referred to, which prove the Mass to have been essentially the same when revised by Pope St. Gregory the Great in 590, and a century earlier by Gelasius, and even under Pope St. Leo the Great. "It also deserves to be noticed, that, at the time when the Roman Liturgy was undergoing these successive revisals, a tradition all along prevailed attributing to one part of it an apostolic origin, and that this part does not appear to have undergone any change whatever. Virgilius, who was Pope between the times of Gelasius and Gregory, tells us, that the 'canonical prayers,' or what is

now called the 'Canon of the Mass,' had been handed down as an apostolical tradition. And much earlier we hear the same from Pope Innocent, who adds, that the apostle from whom they derived it was St. Peter." (p. 5.)

On this precious deposit of apostolical tradition, received from St. Gregory by the English Church, on its conversion, the Anglican reformers laid their sacrilegious hands. These worthy champions of primitive usages, these pious vindicators of the early ages, these zealous restorers of apostolic piety, recklessly (shall we say "through inadvertence?") rejected and abolished this venerable monument of antiquity, and substituted a patch-work liturgy, or "communion service," in which hardly a rite or a prayer is observed that existed in the old. In pages 8 and 9 of the cited Tract, are tables to prove this. The four principal ancient liturgies are compared together, viz. St. Peter's or the Roman, St. James's or the Oriental, St. Mark's or the Egyptian, and St. John's or the Ephesian and Mozarabic. The result is, that in *eleven* points connected with the consecration and communion, they all wonderfully agree. This number might have been probably increased; but we are content to take the statement of the Tract. The communion service discards *five* of these points, alters and mutilates some of the remainder, and arranges the little it has preserved in a different order from any. The statement of this modification is coolly introduced by these words: "The English Reformers prefer an order different from any of these." (p. 8.) We will not enter into any discussion about their right to do so. Oh, no! it would have been quite a pity, if, by any chance, they had preserved in a modern religion practices of such venerable antiquity. But, at any rate, do not call such men *Reformers*. If you will, do not tell us that the purpose of the Reformation was only to clear away modern abuses, and to retain and restore all that was primitive and apostolical! You yourselves say, "it may perhaps be said without exaggeration, that next to the Holy Scriptures, they (the ancient liturgies) possess the greatest claim to our veneration and study." (p. 16.) Yet they whom you call your Fathers, made no scruple of abolishing or completely disfiguring them!

On the other side, we need hardly remind our readers, that the Catholic Liturgy or Mass, as now used, and translated in pocket missals, is nearly word for word identical with that of Gelasius, referred to in our Tract. This subject, however, deserves a fuller discussion than we can at present afford it.

9. Among the points excluded from the Liturgy at the Reformation one is thus specified: "And likewise another prayer (which has been excluded from the English Ritual) 'for the rest and peace of all those who have departed this life in God's faith and fear,' concluding with a prayer for communion with them." (p. 7.) On this subject Dr. Pusey enlarges in a letter, now prefixed to the third volume of the Tracts. He allows that this prayer was excluded from the Anglican Liturgy, by "yielding to the judgment of foreign ultra-reformers." We need not observe that Catholics have retained the practice and the words. Nor shall we find it difficult, in a proper place, to disprove Dr. Pusey's assertions respecting the object of these prayers in the ancient Church, and to show that it was the same as Catholics now propose to themselves.

10. When the most solemn of all Christian rites was thus rudely and irreverently treated, it must not surprise us to find others, less important, handled in like manner. Dr. Pusey has divided into three Tracts (67-69) a long treatise on "Scriptural views of Holy Baptism." It deserves, in many respects, our highest praise; and we freely give it. At pages 266 and following, he presents, in parallel columns, those baptismal rites which were very generally, if not universally, observed in the ancient Church, and which we have retained. The Anglicans, too, kept them for a time. But naturally they could not understand their worth, and sacrificed them to the good pleasure of Bucer. Dr. Pusey thus laments the loss of those primitive observances. "We have lost by all those omissions. Men are impressed by these visible actions, far more than they are aware, or wish to acknowledge. Two points especially were thereby visibly inculcated, which men seem now almost wholly to have lost sight of,—the power of our enemy Satan, and the might of our Blessed Redeemer." (p. 242.) Thus we see what a practical influence on faith these omissions may have. Again: "It has undoubtedly been a device of Satan, to persuade men that this expulsion of himself (by the exorcisms prefixed to our baptism) was unnecessary; he has thereby secured a more undisputed possession. Whether the rite can again be restored in our Church, without greater evil, God only knoweth; or whether it be not irrevocably forfeited; but this is certain, that until it be restored, we shall have much more occasion to warn our flocks of the devices and power of him against whom they have to contend." (p. 243.)

Hence, in another Tract, these authors feelingly deplore the loss, or better to speak, the rejection, of the Catholic Ritual. After quoting passages from the Fathers upon the origin of many ceremonies still retained by us, they conclude: "that, as a whole, the Catholic Ritual was a precious possession, and if we, who have escaped from Popery, have lost not only the possession, but the sense of its value, it is a serious question whether we are not like men who recover from some serious illness, with the loss or injury of their sight or hearing; whether we are not like the Jews returned from captivity, who could never find the rod of Aaron or the Ark of the Covenant, which, indeed, had ever been hid from the world, but then was removed from the temple itself." (No. 34.)

These are grievous lamentations. Thank God, *we* have no reason to make them. The deposit of traditional practices which we received from our forefathers we have kept inviolate. We have rejected no rite, we have hardly admitted one, in the administration of the sacraments, since the days of Gelasius or Gregory.

11. Another primitive practice avowedly neglected in the English Church, is that of fasting, and other austerities. Dr. Pusey has written several Tracts upon the subject. In one, he says: "I would fain hope that there will not long be this variance between our principles and our practice." (No. 18, p. 21.) Again: "the other fasts of the Church require the less to be dwelt upon, either because, as in Lent, her authority is in some degree recognized, although it be very imperfectly and capriciously obeyed," &c. (p. 23.) In this *Tract*, as in many others, a captious spirit in relation to Catholics is observable. We lament it. It is but little creditable to the writer. "To urge," he writes, "that

“fasts were abused by the later Romish Church, is but to assert that they are a means of grace committed to men, &c. It was then among the instances of calm judgment in the Reformers of our Prayer-book,” (we have seen specimens of this calm judgment,) “that, cutting off the abuses which before prevailed, the vain distinctions of meats, the luxurious abstinences, the lucrative dispensations, they still prescribed fasting.”... “The Reformers omitted that which might be a snare to men’s consciences; they left it to every man’s Christian prudence and experience *how* he would fast, but they prescribed the days upon which he should fast, both in order to obtain an unity of feeling and devotion in the members of Christ’s body, and to preclude the temptation to the neglect of the duty altogether.” (p. 7.) Yet, on the whole, the duty, as a general one, *is* neglected. The Common-prayer book prescribes, as days of fasting or abstinence, “All the Fridays in the year, except Christmas-day.” Is this observed in the Anglican Church? The forty days of Lent; are they observed? The Ember days; are they observed? Yet among Catholics, in England, as on the Continent, all these days are strictly observed; all Fridays by abstinence, and all the rest by fasts. The appointment of days, then, was not sufficient. The Reformers, with all their calm judgment, went wrong in not prescribing *how* men are to fast. But, in reality, they rooted up in the Church all the principles by which alone fasting could be practically preserved in it. There is something, therefore, to say the least, ungenerous and unhandsome in praising the Reformers at the expense of the Catholics, for “cutting off abuses which before prevailed,” when this amputation was so clumsily performed as to lead to the total destruction of the thing itself. And this unhandsomeness is doubled by the consideration, that if these abuses existed till then, Catholics were able to correct them without any such violent effects. For if dispensations were then lucrative, they certainly are not so now, either in this country or abroad. There is a heavy penalty in Italy, renewed every year, not only upon every ecclesiastical authority receiving a fee for giving a dispensation from abstinence during Lent, but upon any medical man demanding it for a certificate of weak health, intended for obtaining such dispensation. The difference, then, between our Church and the Anglican, has been this: *that supposing* dispensations till the sixteenth century to have been lucrative, *we* wisely removed the lucre, but kept the necessity of dispensation by ecclesiastical authority, and thereby preserved the practice itself. The Anglicans, retaining the ecclesiastical precept of fasting on stated days, with what Dr. Pusey considers “calm judgment,” vested in each individual the dispensing power, lest it should be lucrative to pastors, and of course, lost all ecclesiastical power of enforcing an ecclesiastical precept. When each man is constituted his own judge, when selfishness is made the supreme umpire between the appetites and an irksome, painful duty, it is easy to foresee the decision. We are sure that a Protestant clergyman would be astonished, if one of his parishioners called upon him at the commencement of Lent, or in an Ember week, to ask his permission, as a pastor and organ of his Church, not to fast. He would probably be more astonished to find that he had a parishioner who thought about fasting at all. Indeed, we have little doubt that Dr. Pusey and his friends would be very glad to place the duty of fasting once more under the safeguard of the Church’s jurisdiction; by

bringing men to the practical conviction that, whatever the Church has enjoined, no faithful son ought to neglect, without a reason which she herself has approved. Did every one fast, who had not obtained this approbation of his neglect, the precept of the Church would not be a dead letter.

Then as to "vain distinctions of meats," surely Dr. Pusey is fully aware that, in the primitive Church, pretty nearly the same distinctions existed as do now among Catholics. St. Chrysostom (*3d Hom. to the People of Antioch*), St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* 4), St. Basil (*1st Hom. on Fasting*), and Hermes, an apostolic Father (*Pastor.* l. iii.), not to quote many decrees of councils and other authorities, tell us that flesh-meat was forbidden on all fast-days. St. John Baptist did not consider distinction of meats vain, when he chose locusts and wild honey for his diet; nor did God when he instituted the old law. The rule for the English Church St. Gregory gave to our apostle St. Augustine, the same as is found in Canon Law. "We abstain from flesh-meat, and from all things which come from flesh, as milk, cheese, and eggs."

What is meant by "luxurious abstinences?" That the rich will often turn into a luxury what is meant for humiliation, must not surely be cast as a reproach upon the duty, nor alleged as a sufficient motive for its abolition. Because the voluptuous who loll upon velvet cushions in well-fitted pews, are better at ease when kneeling in church, than the poor are in their hard beds at home, should the custom of kneeling at worship be abolished? If occasionally conviviality is more indulged on a day of abstinence than becomes it, to the generality it is truly a day of restraint and penance. A Catholic can seldom invite a friend, certainly not a Protestant, to his table on those days, and is generally precluded from accepting an invitation from others. I know Catholics not a few, who, so far from considering fish a delicacy, from being obliged to confine themselves to the use of it on certain days, will not allow it on others to be served on their tables. And many, too, I know who, week after week, find pain in complying with the duty of abstinence. In fact, so generally has this been felt, that within these few years, the Holy See has assented to the petition of the British and Irish Catholics, for the abolition of the abstinence on Saturdays. And the dispensation thus granted, though on such a great scale, was not a "lucrative" one, for it did not put a stiver into the papal treasury.

Dr. Pusey's own *Tracts* afford us sufficient proof of the vast wisdom in his Church, when she "left it to every man's Christian prudence and experience *how* he should fast." The natural consequence has been, that those who wish to do it, know not how. The *Tract* 66 is in answer to a letter by a clergyman (mark that!) who, through the *British Magazine*, desired many illustrations of No. 18. Among these queries are,—“In what is the abstinence of fasting to consist?” “Is there any difference between abstinence and fasting?” The answer to this question is in these different terms,—“Not, I imagine, in our Church.” Now, all this uncertainty, or rather ignorance, proceeds from the Anglican Church not having thought it proper to define *how* men were to fast. A very indifferently instructed Catholic would be ashamed to ask such questions; much more a clergyman.

In conclusion, Dr. Pusey finds himself obliged to answer the objection

that "fasting is Popish." Of course, he denies it. He is right. It may belong to any one who chuses to practise it. Is it Anglican?

12. 'To the practice of fasting is joined that of other works of mortification, such as "hard lodging, uneasy garments," (hair shirts?) "laborious posture in prayer, sufferance of cold," &c., and it is called "part of the foolish wisdom of the day to despise these small things, and disguise its impatience of restraint under some such general maxim as—' that God has no pleasure in self-torture or mortification.'" (No. 66, p. 9.) These sentiments hardly call for a commentary. Few Protestants will read them without pronouncing them popish; no Catholic, without admitting their general truth.

We pass over other points of less importance, in which the defection of the Anglican Church from primitive practices is openly or tacitly acknowledged. There are one or two matters, however, which I think it right to notice, before coming to my concluding remarks.

In the first place, there is constantly a desire manifested to bring the rite of ordination as nearly as possible to the definition of a sacramental institution. Thus, we are told that "ordination, though it does not precisely come within our" (*i. e.* the Anglican) "definition of a sacrament, is, nevertheless, a rite partaking, in a high degree, of the sacramental character, and it is by reference to the proper sacraments that its nature can be most satisfactorily illustrated." (No. 5, p. 10.) The difference seems to be placed in the circumstance, that in the other sacraments the essence lies in the words or form, while in ordination it is placed in the imposition of hands, or outward rite. (No. 1, p. 3.) This is rather a bungling view of the sacramental theory, and leads to important consequences respecting the Eucharist. Of these I shall find a proper place to speak. Dr. Pusey, in his vindication of the *Tracts*, goes even farther, and shows that, according to St. Augustine's definition, ordination might well have been numbered among the sacraments. This definition is no other than that of our Church, "a visible sign of invisible grace." (Vol. iii. p. 11.) On the whole, we should conclude, that the Anglican Church would have done better to have kept St. Augustine's definition. It would have acted in conformity with antiquity, and it would have better preserved the dignity of its supposed priesthood.

Secondly. The retention of ancient doctrines and rites by Catholics is clearly acknowledged. Thus, speaking of the visible Church, we have what follows:—

"Now, the Papists have retained it; and so they have the advantage of possessing an instrument, which is, in the first place, suited to the needs of human nature; and next, is a special gift of Christ, and so has a blessing with it. Accordingly, we see that in its measure success follows their zealous use of it. They act with great force upon the imaginations of men. The vaunted antiquity, the universality, the unanimity of their Church, put them above the varying fashions of the world, and the religious novelties of the day. And truly, when one surveys the grandeur of their system, a sigh arises in the thoughtful mind, to think we should be separated from them. 'Cum talis sis, utinam noster esses!' But, alas, AN UNION IS IMPOSSIBLE. Their communion is infected with heterodoxy; we are bound to flee it as a pestilence. They have established a lie in the place of God's truth; and by their claim of immutability in doctrine, cannot undo the sin they have committed. *They cannot repent. Popery must be destroyed, it cannot be reformed.*"—No. 20, p. 3.

This last phrase I hail with a mixed feeling of pity and satisfaction.



Of pity for those who possess not the same stability as ourselves: of satisfaction at here finding a plain and manly declaration of the attitude in which we mutually stand. To us is left the blessed hope of bringing others into unity with us by gentle arts of persuasive argument; to themselves they reserve, as an *only* resource, the ungracious work of destruction.

Thirdly: The spiritual and devotional character of the Catholic worship and religion is openly avowed. Of the approaching contest between the English Church and ours, it is said:—

“The same feelings which carry men now to dissent will carry them to Romanism—novelty being an essential stimulant of popular devotion; and the Roman system, to say nothing of the intrinsic majesty and truth, which remain in it amid its corruptions, abounding in this and other stimulants of a most potent and effective character. And farther, there will ever be a number of refined and affectionate minds, who, disappointed in finding full matter for their devotional feelings in the English system, as at present conducted, betake themselves, through human frailty, to Rome.”—No. 71, p. 4.

Let me now apply myself to drawing general conclusions from the view which we have given of these *Tracts*. Observe, I have only treated of their proposed return to ancient practices, now lost among the Anglicans. I resume, then, the query proposed at the beginning of this Tract. What has been gained by the Reformation, considered as an attempted return to primitive purity? We have here a clear confession that, upon a dozen points, affecting nothing less than the constitution of the Church, and the authority of its hierarchy, the grounds upon which the most solemn dogmas rest, the public offices of the Church, the frequent use of the Eucharistic sacrament, the performance of daily service, the observance of fasting, and other great moral precepts, the Anglican Church, under the mask of a reformation, contrived to place things in a worse state than they were before, and than they now exist in the Catholic Church. What title can be established to the name of reformation in all these particulars?

But I fear lest, in often repeating this query, I may have been guilty of a mistake, small in itself, but more important in its results. I have spoken of our Church as the unreformed, in opposition to the Anglican, as *professing* to be reformed. By applying to ourselves the negative epithet, I only meant to speak of such reformation as led to the deplorable effects acknowledged in the *Tracts* to have taken place in Anglicanism. We disavow any reform amongst us, wrought on the principle it adopted, of destroying, or abolishing, all in which there was abuse, real or pretended. No Catholic will deny that, in many matters of Church discipline, relaxation had crept into religious practices, before the Reformation. The Church, in many ways, through Papal constitutions, particular synods, and chiefly by the council of Trent, issued decrees of reform. Whoever opens the statutes of the council, will see in every sheet “*Decretum de reformatione*.” The Catholic Church, however, went to work upon principles totally different from the Anglican. The religious orders were supposed to be lax in discipline, and open to abuses. England suppressed them, seized their revenues, turned upon the world thousands of inoffensive men and women who had long abandoned it, and abolished the ascetic life, which the *Tracts* after

Bingham, acknowledge to have existed in the primitive Church. (*Records of the Church*, No. XI, p. 3.) The Catholic Church inquired into the abuses, framed the wisest regulations for their correction and prevention, and only suppressed, where, as in the case of the Humiliati, real crime or gross degeneracy could be established on proof. The education of clergy was a matter much neglected in many dioceses. The English reformers took not a single step towards establishing a system of clerical education, unless it was the suppression of schools and chantries. The Catholic "reformers" at Trent, obliged every diocese to erect and maintain an ecclesiastical seminary, in which the young aspirants to the clerical state should live in community, dividing their time between study and spiritual exercises, under the watchful eye of the bishop, and persons deputed by him.

There had been grievous abuses complained of in the collation of benefices, from the pluralities accumulated on one individual, or their collation on absentees, such as officers of the Papal court. The Anglicans have left all these evils,—perhaps have aggravated them. They allow many benefices, with cure of souls, to devolve on one man's head; and Cheltenham, and Leamington, and Brighton, will bear testimony to the Irish rectories and vicarages, which allow their incumbents to live beyond the reach of their flocks' complaints. Since the council of Trent, those abuses have been completely cut off in the Catholic Church, and pluralities, with cure of souls, are totally unknown among us.

I could run on through some hundred such comparisons, to show the opposite characters of our two reforms. Ours was a *conservative reform*; we pruned away the decayed part; we placed the vessel in the furnace, and, the dross being melted off, we drew it out bright and pure. Yours was *radical* to the extreme; you tore up entire plants by the roots, because you said there was a blight on some one branch; you threw the whole vessel into the fire, and made merry at its blaze. Now that you go to look for it again, you find nothing but ashes. And you are surprised at this!

Gladly, too, would I institute a comparison between the instruments of our respective reformatations. I would put St. Charles Borromeo against Cranmer, or Bartholomew de Martyrilius against Bucer; the first as agents, the latter as auxiliaries. It has often appeared to me, that Divine Providence was graciously pleased to give the lie to those who, under pretence of grievous abuses and errors, caused schism in the Church, by raising from its bosom, at that very moment, and soon after, such men as no Reformed Church can boast of. The tree might have been known by its fruits; an evil tree could not have brought forth such worthy fruits of charity, of pastoral zeal, of penitential spirit, as then came to adorn the Catholic Church. And two things strike us principally in this matter. First, that they flourished exactly after the western continental Church is supposed by these Anglican writers to have set on itself the seal of reprobation, by sanctioning heresy at Trent. Nay, some among them, as St. Charles, were the most active promoters of its decisions. Secondly, that these extraordinary men were all distinguished for their attachment to this Church, and made it their glory that they belonged to it. We meet in their writings with no regrets at a single step it had taken, no intimation of a thought, that it had inadvertently let slip a particle of primitive truth

They were really a crown, aye, a crown of gold, to their mother; not as the fading garlands of Ephraim, put on the head in a moment of intoxication. They were heroes, whose names, after three centuries, are fresh in the mouths of men. Who, among the ordinary class of Anglicans, speaks of Parker, or Jewel, or Bancroft, or Cranmer, or Bramhall, as of men whose good deeds have descended in blessings on generations, or whose wise sayings are as maxims of life upon the lips of children? But such are the memories of a Francis de Sales, and a Vincent of Paul, a Philip Neri, and an Ignatius Loyola. Cities, provinces, and kingdoms, publicly testify their veneration for their memories, and their gratitude for the benefits they conferred. Children, who owe their early knowledge of God, and of good letters, to the gratuitous education of the continent, lisp, with tender affection, the names of a Joseph Calasanctius, or a Jerom Emilian. Thousands of sick, whose pillows are watched with kindness by self-devoted, unpaid attendants, pronounce blessings on a Camillus de Lellis, or a John of God, or a Vincent of Paul, who inspired their successors with such charity. Has any diocess of England raised a statue to its bishop like the Colossus of Arona? Has any of its cities ever honoured one of its priests, as Rome has done Philip Neri, with the title of its apostle?

But this comparison between the English and the true Church, at the time when the former boasts of having risen into primitive splendour, and left the other buried in error and corruptions, becomes still more striking, when made with reference to the spiritual life. Never in any period of the Church was it illustrated by persons more deeply enamoured of the cross, more versed in the science of the inward life, or more sublimely occupied in contemplation, than the Catholic, at the very moment when England thought proper to abandon its unity. The writings of St. Theresa, and St. John of the Cross, not to mention the lives of such men as Felix a Cantalicio, Peter of Alcantara, Pascal Baylon, and innumerable others, are enough to have added glory to the true Church, in the brightest period of its history. One would have supposed, that a young and vigorous establishment, the Phœnix-church of England, springing forth into a new life from the funeral pile where she had consumed the decayed elements of her previous existence, would have flown upwards, with a steady gaze upon the sun of righteousness, and given proof of her renewed vigour, by her eagle-flights towards the regions of heaven. Instead of this, she fell heavily on the ground, scorched in plumage, and shorn of wing, and condemned to walk or creep upon the earth's surface, and to seek her food, with dimmer eye, in its stagnant, lifeless pools. At the same time, the spirit of God seemed restless and prolific in the heart of her rival, bringing forth thoughts and aspirations which rose up heavenwards, as to their proper home, unclouded by the smallest stain that would show them to have risen from a bosom tainted by heresy and corruption.

If, then, nothing was gained by the Protestant Reformation on behalf of good discipline, the salutary use of the sacraments, and such-like holy practices, nothing surely was gained in deep spirituality, and the perfection of the inward life. And if, on the other hand, the Catholic reform of the Church cleared away abuses by time introduced, leaving the good intact, so did it, at the same time witness within it a marvellous

development of the principles of divine contemplation and close union of the soul with God. That Christianity could hope for no advantage in this respect from the Reformation, is acknowledged by a late writer on the German department of that awful revolution. Speaking of the ruin which it caused to the German empire, Menzel observes:—"At so high a price as this, the small gains of this measure were too dearly bought. For, whatever improvements the new Church might boast of, whatever errors and malpractices she could charge her mother or eldest sister with, never will she be able to deny her the merit of having preserved and disseminated the light of divine truth and of human learning; never will she have it in her power to make out a case of necessity, or to form another path to salvation, than that on which Tauler, Thomas à Kempis, and Fenelon, have found the right way." (*Menzel, neuere Geschichte der Deutschen von der Reformation*, Breslaw, 1826, vol. i. p. 7.)

I shall of course be told, that the separation from the Church of Rome took place in consequence of doctrinal errors. Or, according to the theory of the *Tracts*, that, by sanctioning those errors, she separated herself from the reforming Anglican Church. Much that is connected with this question, hangs upon the important one of apostolical succession, and the existence of schism in that Church. That must be laid aside for the present. But we look at the matter under another aspect.

We are told, then, that the Catholic Church had departed, in matters of faith, from primitive truth, and had enslaved the hearts of men to error. The charge was twofold. The Catholic Church was accused of having corrupted faith, and loaded the practices of the Church with human and superstitious usages. The Reformation attacked both. It cut off many doctrines then believed by all the Church, saying: "these are not warranted by primitive belief." It abolished almost the entire liturgy, and other services in the Church, the rites used in the administration of sacraments, and many other observances, saying: "these are human inventions."

Well, the work was done, and God knows, thoroughly done. Nearly three hundred years roll on, the minds of men gradually cool, and they begin to discover that almost every one of the rites, ceremonies, and practices, abolished at the Reformation as superstitious additions to the primitive simplicity of worship, were, and are, most venerable, and even traceable to apostolic origin! What becomes of the other half? "Oh, there we do not yield an inch. Our reformers were certainly too hasty in dealing with outward observances. They allowed themselves to be misled. But in matters of faith, in which they condemned Rome, you must not touch them. There all was done deliberately and wisely."—Gently, good sirs: you yourselves have yielded much. You have certainly betrayed a lurking desire that ordination should be considered a sacrament. You yourselves acknowledged "that the English Church has committed mistakes in the practical working of its system: nay, that it is *incomplete* even in its formal doctrine and discipline." (No. 71, p. 27.) You concede, that "though your own revolution" (here you have for once hit upon the right name) "of opinion and practice was slower, and more carefully considered than those of your neighbours, yet it was too

much influenced by secular interest, sudden external events, and the will of individuals, to carry with it any vouchers for the perfection and entireness of the religious system thence emerging." You have confessed that "the hurry and confusion of the times led to a settlement of religion incomplete and defective." (p. 30.) You allow that your "doctrine on the Blessed Eucharist, though, on the whole, protected safe through a dangerous time by the cautious Ridley, yet, in one or two places, was clouded by the interpolations of Bucer." (p. 32.)

In other words, you allow the godly work of Reformation to have been but an incomplete and ill-digested work. You see in it errors and omissions in every part. But not a fault of commission will you acknowledge. Not a single positive definition was mistaken. You have drawn a nice limit: you have traced very minutely the boundary mark. On one side you see palpable imperfections, inconsiderate rejections, unnecessary changes, excessive innovations, unwarranted interferences of the civil power, unlucky concessions to the pressure of circumstances, and, by consequence, "a system of religion incomplete and defective." But on the other side of the boundary, these same men, under the very same circumstances, without any new light, did not commit a single error. Oh no, there they were impeccable. They were repeatedly deceived when the question was about omissions,—never when they adopted. They fell into constant oversights when they rejected, never once when they defined. Wonderful sagacity! Incomprehensible—far beyond the gift of infallibility, which you are so careful to disclaim for your Church! (p. 27.)

But I fancy that a prudent enquirer will ask for some better proof of this wonderful preservation, than the mere assertion of these gentlemen that their own Church "kept the nearest of any to the complete truth." (p. 29.) When you acknowledge so many false steps, and allow that you have no security against others, surely men have a right to doubt whether you *have* escaped them. The Catholic Church is consistent. She says, "I am gifted with infallibility, therefore I have fallen into no errors." The Anglican rejects infallibility, but claims an equal obedience.

The argument, however, may be urged more home, as thus; It will be acknowledged, and by none more consistently than by the authors of the *Tracts*, that outward forms are great safeguards of doctrine, and that the abandonment of rites or observances of very remote antiquity, will often endanger some point of doctrine in connexion with them. Who can doubt that the neglect of ecclesiastical censures has led to the enfeebling of Church authority among the Anglicans? Have we not heard Dr. Pusey complain, that the abandonment of the exorcisms in baptism has much contributed to make men in his Church forget the power of Satan, and the might of our Redeemer? Now, to apply these principles, let me take an instance which lately struck me on occasion of the Christmas solemnity. Let us suppose that one of the clergymen who conduct these *Tracts*, admiring, as he professes, the Roman Breviary, had induced several of his brethren and friends to recite its Matins together on Christmas-eve, as was usual in the ancient Church. They would find nothing objectionable in the office, but rather much possessing a sweet solemnity. For we will imagine them to omit the *Ave Maria* at the beginning, and the *Alma Redemptoris* at the end. These are their two

principal stumbling-blocks. Arrived at the third Nocturn, one proceeds to read the Homily of St. Gregory upon the gospel, as follows:—"Quia largiente Domino, Missarum solemniter hodie celebraturi sumus, loqui diu de Evangelio non possumus." (*Hom. viii. in Evang.*) "Since, through the divine favour, we shall this day thrice celebrate solemn Mass, we cannot speak at length on the gospel." These admirers of primitive antiquity would have been a little staggered at such a declaration of St. Gregory's. Now, if one of them had started an objection that such words were nonsense in the mouth of a Protestant clergyman, and that he could not feel justified in claiming any thing in common with a Pope who spoke such Popish language, what reply would the director make? "It is true," he would have to reply, "that appearances are against us. We must acknowledge that the communion service at the time of St. Gregory, and even much earlier, was called the Mass. When we restored primitive Christianity at the Reformation, we wisely abolished the name. It is true that the Mass recited at that time, and even in the age of Gelasius or St. Leo, was, prayer for prayer, and ceremony for ceremony, the same as that of the Popish Missal. On the same blessed occasion, we considerately suppressed it, though probably coming from the Apostles, and substituted something better of our own. It is true that, on Christmas-day, this identical Popish Mass was then celebrated three times, precisely as it will be between to-night and to-morrow at the Catholic chapel, and by comparing the *Ordo Romanus* with the modern Missals, it is evident that the three masses were the same as now. For the homily we are reading is upon the gospel, still said by the Papists at their first mass, and cannot apply to the one gospel preserved in our beautiful service, from the third. This practice, though so ancient, it was the office of our godly Reformation to destroy. But what matter all these things? We have lost nothing with them. Our communion, which we shall perform to-morrow (if a sufficient number of communicants can be got together), is the true inheritor of all these services. The Papists have been most careful to preserve the Mass just as St. Gregory celebrated it,—they have been sticklers for every word and ceremony, for the very terms and titles then used. But our Articles teach us, that all such 'sacrifices of masses...were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.' After such a declaration, can you doubt but that that holy Pontiff, if he again appeared on earth, would refuse to have any part in the Popish Mass, and admire and approve our beautiful communion service? Would he not say, 'It is much more probable that the Papists (as they are called in derision for their attachment to my See),—who have jealously preserved every tittle of the Liturgy I sent into Britain by the hands of Augustine,—who still keep up the practices we followed in my pontificate,—have lost the true doctrine we considered embodied in that Liturgy respecting the blessed Sacrament, than that the Protestants should not have retained or regained it, when they rejected almost every particle of the words and forms instituted to secure it?'"

This would really be the sort of answer to which a Protestant might be driven on such an occasion. But every Catholic, priest or layman, who read or heard those words in the Christmas office, took them in their most literal and natural sense, and saw no incongruity, no unfitness in the recital of them after 1200 years. Perhaps some pastors com-

menced their sermon in the very same words, and their flocks did not see reason to consider them a quotation from any older authority.

If the curious wish came over them to ascertain whether the *things*, as much as the *names*, agree, they would open the works of Tommasi or Assemani, and find what is there given as the Mass of St. Gelasius precisely the same as they heard in their own church. Could they require a stronger security that they inherited the faith of those ages, than in this cautious jealousy of their Church, preserving from destruction or alteration, the prayers, rites, and system of worship, in which this faith was deposited, recorded, and professed? Would they be reasonable, if they suspected that they alone had carefully kept the one, who had scornfully and profanely rejected the other?

Enough has been said to abate the pretended claims of the Reformation to our esteem or admiration, as a reprimand of pure Christianity, a return to the practices and doctrines of antiquity. We, of course, are unable to comprehend the love and reverence with which these well-intentioned, but ill-guided men look upon that awful revolution. They seem to speak of it as of some wisely-devised plan of improvement; for they are repeatedly praising the calm judgment or the wisdom of the Reformers, or the "Fathers of the Reformation." Contradictions, it is true, are to be found in what they write on this subject. But on the whole, they consider it as a work directed by the Providence of God, through the agency of holy men. To our minds, it presents a series of shocks and convulsions, regulated by no law but the passions of men. Like the ocean broken over its ordinary limits, the revolutionary principle sent forth wave after wave, each to destroy the sand-heap which its predecessor had raised, till, by their successive exertions, a level was at last obtained, but a level, alas! measured by "the line of confusion and the stones of emptiness." (*Isaiah xxxiv. 11, Prot. vers.*) Every political ruler, King, Protector, or Queen, laid his irreverent hand upon the ill-fated Church, and fashioned its plastic clergy after his own will; every divine who gained influence, changed and remodelled its services and articles according to the system he had learnt on the continent, or invented at home. It was the creature of accidents, but of accidents entirely destructive; not one came to fill up a breach in its walls, or to set up what another had plucked down. Devastation came upon devastation, and destruction swallowed up the traces of destruction. "*Residuum erucæ comedit locusta, et residuum locustæ comedit bruchus, et residuum bruchi comedit rubigo.*" (*Joel i. 4.*) So long as there was a sound place left in the Church on which a blow could be struck, they laid them on, and spared not. It was not till every limb, from the crown of the head to the sole of the foot, had been disfigured, and no more soundness was in her, that they desisted. And now, because her wounds are healed over, and the breath of life is still in her nostrils, we are called to consider and pronounce her fair and perfect as in the days of her youth! Because, through a special mercy, every trace of good religion was not entirely consumed—because the desolation was not utter, as Sodom and Gomorrah's—we are invited to hail as a blessing the storm that ravaged it, and the plague that scourged it!

Sincerely must every Catholic deplore the infatuation of such as think and act in this manner. But they have a claim upon other and better

feelings than those of idle sympathy. Few more pernicious sacrifices have been made to the false divinities worshipped by the age, than that of denying the spirit of proselytism to be inherent in Catholicity. In the odious sense of the word, as an intermeddling intrusive spirit, we disown it; but as a steady, unceasing desire to bring others to the possession of the same truth as we hold, a prudent yet zealous endeavour to recommend that truth by word and action, it is an essential portion of the Christian spirit of charity. Our faith, though it may remove mountains, is nought without it. Ever since these words were uttered, "We have found him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write. . . Come and see," (*John* i. 45,) it has been the very essence of the apostolic and consequently of the Christian spirit. For our own parts, we have no disguise. We wish for no veil over our conduct. It is our desire, and shall be, to turn the attention of our Catholic brethren to the new forms of our controversy with Protestants, in the anxious hope that they will devote their energies to its study, and push the spiritual warfare into the heart of our adversary's country. That in some directions this is begun, we are able to assert. There are not wanting those who feel the insufficiency of our controversial endeavours in the past, to meet the exigencies of the present moment. And we are confident that all our excellent seminaries, at home and abroad, will use all diligence for repairing their defects. There is much that weighs heavily upon our breasts in reference to this subject. Time, and, still more, the Divine blessing, will, we trust, enable us to develope our meaning, and to effect our designs.



OCCASIONED BY THE "TRACTS FOR THE TIMES," AND  
THE PUBLICATION OF A NEW EDITION OF THE WORKS  
OF THE REV. RICHARD HOOKER, WITH ADDITIONS  
ARRANGED BY THE REV. JOHN KEBLE.

I PROPOSE, in the present Tract, to discuss the momentous question, how far the claim advanced on behalf of the Anglican Church to the rights and privileges of Apostolic Succession is valid.

The "*Tracts for the Times*" are for ever inculcating upon their readers, the belief that the Anglican Church possesses authority by apostolic descent. I will first establish this point by a few extracts.

"We have been born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. The Lord Jesus Christ gave his spirit to his Apostles; they, in their turn, laid their hands upon those who should succeed them; and these, again, on others: and so the sacred gift has been handed down to our present bishops, who have appointed us as their assistants, and, in some respects, their representatives."—  
No. i. p. 2.

"We, who believe in the Nicene Creed, must acknowledge it a high privilege that we belong to the apostolic Church. How is it that most of us are, almost avowedly, so cold and indifferent in our thoughts of this privilege?.....For many years we have been much in the habit of resting our claim on the general duties of submission to authority, of decency and order, of respecting precedents long established,—instead of appealing to that warrant which marks us *exclusively* for GOD'S AMBASSADORS."—  
No. iv. p. 1.

Thus we see that, at the very outset of their publication, the Tract writers are careful to inculcate this idea of the existence of a succession from the Apostles in the hierarchy of the Anglican Church, and of a consequent obligation on the part of the laity to pay it submission and obedience. But the tract No. xv. is entitled, "On the Apostolical Succession in the English Church." It treats of the popular objection (and a well-grounded objection we could easily prove it), that in assuming this privilege of apostolic succession, and its consequent rights, High-Churchmen must recur to Rome as the fountain-head of their orders, which is inconsistent in men that reprobate "Popery." It proceeds to answer this objection, and then to give the grounds whereon the Church of England lays claim to the succession. As this tract will form my principal text whereupon I shall now comment, I will reserve my extracts for each part of my subject as I shall want them. In the meantime, I may refer, for further evidence of this determination in the Oxford divines to claim all the rights of a Church legally descended from the Apostles, to the Tracts, No. v. p. 1 & 7, and entitled, "The Episcopal Church Apostolical."

It is my intention to discuss the question between us and the Anglican upon this subject, independently of all inquiry into the

validity of their ordinations. And this determination is the result of much serious reflection. Before stating my reasons, however, I must be allowed to protect myself against any misrepresentation. Let it not for a moment be imagined, that in thus waiving the inquiry into the value of English ordinations, I am prepared to admit their validity. On the contrary, my sincere and earnest conviction is, that, independent of all historical questions they are decidedly invalid, and nothing worth. I do not, therefore, sacrifice one inch of 'vantage ground to our opponents, when I agree to put aside, in this inquiry into their pretensions to apostolical descent and jurisdiction, the question of the validity of their ordinations. It is only for the following reasons that I do so:—

First, The question of fact regarding the first Anglican consecration has lately been matter of controversy between several Catholic writers; and those of no mean reputation on either side. I wish not at present to revive the dispute. But neither do I wish to combat with arguments, the validity of which might be questioned by some of our side. Secondly, the two inquiries, if united, would be very long; and, as each can be conducted independently of the other, I must choose one which most directly meets the theories of our adversaries. Thirdly, the ground will be more completely cut away from under their feet, if I prove that, even granting them, for argument's sake, that their ordinations are valid, or were at the beginning, still they have not, nor ever had, any part in the apostolical succession, but are a schismatical Church in the fullest sense of the word; so that the works of their ministry are wholly unprofitable, and their jurisdiction none. Such are my motives for dispensing at once from entering upon the question of English orders.

In the passages above quoted, and in all others which treat of this subject, in our authors, it is assumed that ordination or imposition of hands transmits at once apostolical jurisdiction. It is considered sufficient, to admit that the bishops of the establishment have been validly consecrated, to conclude thence that they are possessed of authority in their respective sees. Let the reader peruse the seventh tract, where he will find the simple fact of succession in a see through lawful consecration, alleged as a sufficient ground for admitting the transmission of the apostolic succession. I shall, therefore, have to inquire into two points. First, does consecration, even though valid, confer jurisdiction; secondly, what will vitiate the episcopacy of a see, or province, or kingdom, so as to cut it off from all participation in the rights of apostolical succession and jurisdiction. As the divines with whom I deal possess the greatest respect for ecclesiastical antiquity, and, in fact, agree with me that it is the judge of appeal upon such questions as the present, whereon Scripture has left us no canon or rule, I shall make it the test of their pretensions, and judge their Church as I am conscientiously convinced

it would have been judged by the fathers and councils of the first centuries.

I. The distinction between ordination and jurisdiction is so clearly expressed in ancient ecclesiastical regulations, that men as conversant in them as the Oxford divines cannot have overlooked it. For we read of bishops, acknowledged as such, who yet were not allowed to exercise any act of episcopal authority, not even to ordain. The council of Ephesus mentions bishops who had no churches nor any settled see; it calls them ἀπολιῶδες σχολάζοντες, καὶ ἐκκλησίας μὴ ἔχοντες “cityless, unemployed, and possessed of no churches.”\* When Eustathius, Metropolitan of Pamphylia, had renounced his bishopric, and another had been elected in his place, it was referred to the same synod what was to be done with him; and the fathers decided as follows:—“We define it to be right and proper, that, without any contradiction, he retain the name and honour and communion of a bishop; but on condition that he neither have the authority of ordaining, nor offer up sacrifice in any Church by his own right; unless, for the sake of his assistance, or by way of concession through christian love, some brother and fellow-bishop kindly permit him.”†

Sozomen mentions, “Barses and Eulogius (monks) who afterwards were both bishops, not of any city, but for honour only, consecrated in their monastery to reward their good actions. In which manner also,” he adds, “Lazarus, of whom I have spoken above, was also a bishop.”‡ It is no doubt true, that, in general, the Church did not approve of the appointment of bishops without a see,—a practice condemned by the council of Sardica. Still, they were allowed to be bishops void of jurisdiction. In the conferences of Carthage (*Collatio Carthaginensis*), Petilianus the Donatist calls such bishops phantoms (*imagines*), as opposed to real bishops (*Cardinales et authenticos episcopos*).§ The thirty-seventh canon of the Trullan Synod allowed bishops whose sees were in the hands of barbarians or others, and therefore inaccessible, to ordain and discharge all other episcopal functions. In commenting upon this canon, Zonaras observes, that there were other bishops, who, out of mere sloth or love of ease, would not reside, nor undergo the episcopal burden, yet retained the honour and character of bishops.|| The cases of Meletius and of the Donatist bishops confirm the same point of ancient ecclesiastical doctrine. Of the latter, I shall have to treat in the next tract. The former is as follows:—Meletius, Bishop of Lycopolis, deposed by St. Peter of Alexandria, went from place to place consecrating bishops, under pretence that he was vicar to the patriarch of Antioch. The council of Nicea took cognizance of the matter. It acknowledged the

\* In Relat. ad Cœlestin. Labb. tom. iii. col. 661.

† Ibid. col. 805.

‡ H. E. lib. vi. cap. 34

§ Ad calcem Oper. S. Optati, p. 277. ed. Dupin. See also Christian Lupus Ven. 1724, tom. ii. p. 73.

|| Apud Thomassinum, “Vetus et nova Ecclesiæ Disciplina,” t. i. p. 97.

validity of the imposition of hands, but denied jurisdiction or place in the apostolical succession to such as had thus received it. It, however, sanctioned that, upon the death of any legitimate bishop, one of those consecrated by Meletius might succeed, provided he were chosen by the people, and found qualified and approved by the patriarch of Alexandria; in other words, if to the valid but illegal consecration, the institution required by the ecclesiastical law was added.\* And speaking of the decrees of this great council, I must not omit the eighth canon, which regards the Cathari, or Novatians. It enacts, that upon renouncing their errors, they shall be reconciled to the Church, and allowed to remain among the clergy. Where one of the bishops returns, the Catholic bishop shall retain his authority, and the other either retain the title, though exercising the functions of a simple presbyter; or, should the bishop not approve of having him with him, he must provide for him a place as chorepiscopus, or as priest. But two bishops must not be in one city.† It is not necessary to delay my readers with evidence that, on the other hand, episcopal jurisdiction was exercised by simple presbyters in former times, when deputed by proper authority, though, of course, they did not ordain or perform other offices requiring the episcopal character.‡ But what I have said is amply sufficient to prove that the reasoning of the new divines is completely false, when they go about to persuade men that if their bishops were truly consecrated by imposition of hands, they became inheritors of apostolical jurisdiction. For in all the instances above given, and in others that will later come under discussion, there was no question about the validity of the episcopal consecration, or the absolute power of the consecrators to confer orders; yet, still, it was denied to those consecrated by them to exercise any acts of power, except by the accession of some new sanction. And this, as in the case of Eustathius, was not a deprivation, nor in punishment of crime, nor even a consequence of illegality in preceding acts, but arose from a clear sense that one portion of the episcopal office did not necessarily include the other. The tract-writers constantly mix up the power of validly consecrating the Eucharist with that of instructing or governing (No. xv. p. 2; No. iv. p. 2); which is quite at variance with ancient doctrine and practice. Supposing, therefore, that Barlow and the others consecrated Parker, and that all was validly done as to matter and form, it does not follow that he, or those who, like him became possessed of episcopal sees in England and Ireland, and received a similar consecration, were the lawful holders thereof, or the legitimate successors of their first bishops. It may be a case like that of the Meletian bishops, or others of which I shall speak.

---

\* Epistola Conc. Nicaeni ad Eccles. Alex. apud Labbaeum, tom. ii. col. 251.

† Ib. col. 32.

‡ See Bolgeni, "L'Episcopato ossia della potestà di governar la Chiesa." Rome, 1789, pp. 151 seqq.

II. Thus far I have been engaged with my first inquiry, which in fact is only a preliminary to the second. We have seen that, in the ancient Church, consecration was not considered to confer necessarily the jurisdiction attached to apostolical succession. My second enquiry is, "what will vitiate the episcopacy of a see, a province, or kingdom, so as to cut it off from all participation in the rights of apostolical succession and jurisdiction?"

We have seen the case of the Novatians treated in the eighth canon of Nicea, and the decree regarding them is extremely valuable, as embodying principles acted upon most rigidly in the ancient Church. From it we are necessarily led to the conclusion that "any appointment to a bishoprick, even by valid consecration, which is at variance with the canons actually in force in the Church, is unlawful, and leaves the bishop so appointed void of all jurisdiction and power; so that he is a usurper if he take possession of a see."

Novatian himself was without doubt validly consecrated by those real bishops; though they are said by St. Cornelius to have performed the ceremony while in a state of intoxication, and not aware of what they were about.\* He thus set himself up against Pope Cornelius, whose ordination he denied, and claimed the see of Rome. But all his acts were considered invalid, and the fathers go so far as to declare that his episcopacy was null, and that he was not consecrated.† St. Pacian, however, draws the exact line of distinction, when he calls him, "*sine consecratione legitima episcopum factum adeoque nec factum*," "made a bishop without legitimate consecration, and therefore not made."‡ The bare fact, therefore, of his being validly consecrated a bishop was not sufficient, because he had not been lawfully constituted such.

Further, the Council of Nicea made the following canon:—"This is generally manifest, that if any one shall have been made bishop without the consent of his Metropolitan, the general council defines that he ought to be no bishop."§ Pope Innocent I renewed the decree of Pope Siricius, "*ut extra conscientiam metropolitani episcopi nullus audeat ordinare episcopum*," "that without the consent of his metropolitan bishop, no one should dare to ordain a bishop."|| St. Leo the Great writes more explicitly that such are

\* Epist. ad Fabium Alexand. ap. Euseb. H.E. lib. vi. cap. 43, ed. Valesii. The three bishops seem to have consecrated Novatian expressly to the See of Rome.

The Canons which allow Novatian bishops to be appointed to sees, after they have been reconciled with the Church, prove that their consecration was held valid. This difference between consecration and jurisdiction, or valid and legitimate consecration at once clears up the apparently contradictory expressions of the fathers.

† The Council of Alexandria, Anno 339, says he is no bishop. Labbe, tom. ii. col. 542. St. Cyprian reckons him among those "*qui nemine episcopatum dante, episcopi sibi nomen assumunt*,"—"who assume the name of bishop without any one having given the episcopacy," that is any one authorised to give it.

‡ Epist. ii. ad Sympronianum. He likewise describes him as one "*quem consecrante nullo linteata sedes acceperit*."

§ Can. vi. ap. Labbe, tom. ii. col. 41.

|| Ep. ii. ad Vietr. Roth, cap. iii. ap. Const. Ep. Rom. Pont.

not to be considered bishops, "who are neither chosen by the clergy, nor desired by the people, nor consecrated by the bishops of the province, with authority of the Metropolitan."\* And Pope Hilarius, speaking of the consecration of Mamertus contrary to the canons, leaves it, after severe reproof, to the Metropolitan to decide whether or no he shall act as a bishop.†

In these and other instances, as Bolgeni remarks, there is no question of removing or deposing; but such bishops were not supposed to have ever possessed any jurisdiction from the beginning, and consequently were not considered to be partakers of the apostolical authority transmitted by *legitimate* succession.‡ Nor is this a mere inference of others, or his, but it is borne out by the express testimony of ancient fathers, who clearly state that such nullity of episcopal nomination was the necessary consequence of the violation of the canons in force. St. Leo, referring to the Nicene canons, says, "*infirmum atque irritum erit, quidquid à predictorum Patrum Canonibus discreparit*," "whatever shall be at variance with the canons of the aforesaid fathers, shall be null and void."§ St. Athanasius speaks of Gregory, who was intruded into the see of Alexandria, in like manner; but I shall have to quote the passage later.

An important question meets us here, and one which the reasoning of the *Tracts for the Times* throws in our way. Do the canons, the infringement of which invalidate, as far as jurisdiction goes, episcopal consecration, form a fixed code? in other words, was it only the violation of the Nicene decree that produced this effect, or the simple departure from the rules in force at any given time, such rules being variable? I say that the *Tracts for the Times* oblige me to discuss this question here, though perhaps prematurely. For to vindicate the English Church from the accusation of schism, they quote a decree of the council of Ephesus, which having secured the liberties of the Church of Cyprus from the usurpations of the Antiochian patriarch, generalizes its principles and orders, that *the rights of every province should be preserved pure and inviolate, which have always belonged to it, according to the usage which has always obtained*." These words are thus emphatically printed by the tract-writer, who proceeds to comment upon the canon as follows:—

"Here we have a remarkable parallel to the dispute between Rome and us; and we see what was the decision of the general Church upon it. It will be observed, the decree is passed *for all provinces in all future times*, as well as for the immediate exigency. Now this is a plain refutation of the Romanists on their own principles. They profess to hold the canons of the primitive Church; the very line they take is to declare the Church to be one and the same in all ages. Here then they witness against themselves. The Pope *has* encroached on the rights of other Churches, and violated the canon above cited. Herein is the difference between his relation to us, and that of any civil ruler, whose power was in its origin

\* Epist. clxvii. ad Rustic. Narbon.

† Epist. xi. ap. Labb. tom. iv. col. 1046.

‡ Epist. cxiv. al lxxxvii. ad Synod. Chalced.

§ Ubi supra, p. 166.

illegally acquired. Doubtless we are bound to obey the monarch under whom we are born, even though his ancestor were an usurper. Time legitimizes a conquest. But this is not the case in spiritual matters. The Church goes by *fixed laws*; and this usurpation has all along been counter to one of her acknowledged standing ordinances, founded on reasons of universal application."—vol. i. No. xv. p. 8.

How far this canon will serve the writer's turn will in the sequel perhaps appear. At present I only wish to meet the false assertions upon which his argument is based. First, I would ask him, for it is more his affair than mine, does he or his Church hold that this decree is unalterable, or that the Church which made that canon may not vary its discipline at different times? If he allow that it may, then does this decree, securing to each province in perpetuity whatever rights it *then* possessed, prove nothing. If he maintain against us, as he seems to do, that the Church goes by *fixed laws*, and that no circumstance can sanction a variation in them, then I call upon him to be consistent, and take, in the same invariable sense, other canons of councils respecting bishops. Thus the general council of Nicea, in its fifteenth canon, expressly enacts that "no bishop, priest, or deacon, be translated from one city or see to another;" and that, "if after the definition of this holy and great synod, any one shall attempt to make such translation, it shall be considered null and void, and the person must be restored to the Church for which he was originally ordained bishop, priest, or deacon.\* Does the Anglican Church stand by this canon? Does the writer consider his Grace of Canterbury, and Charles James of London, unlawfully possessed of their sees, and their authority void, because, in the face of this canon of a general council, they have been translated from other sees? Yet in it we find the very qualification on which the author lays so much stress on that of Ephesus, that it regards the future; and as the Church is governed by *fixed laws*, this holds as yet. And, moreover, this canon was renewed and enforced by the Council of Chalcedon in its fifth canon.† In like manner, the sixteenth canon of Nicea forbids the clergy to abandon their churches, that is, not to reside; and the seventeenth orders the deposition of all such as place their money at interest. Does the English hierarchy admit either of these canons to be binding?

The writer could not, surely, be serious when he maintained the unalterable nature of canons that regarded the rights of sees to independence; still less when he urged this maxim as maintained by Catholics. It is true that writing for the laity, and consequently giving no references, such extracts from ancient documents with such a gloss, will blind and perhaps captivate obedience; but one versed in

---

\* Ap. Labbe, tom. ii. col. 244. St. Jerome gives us the motives of this canon, *the desire of bishops to pass from poor to rich sees*. "In Nicæna Synodo a Patribus est decretum, ne de alia ad aliam Ecclesiam Episcopus transferatur: ne virginalis pauperulæ societate contempta, ditionis adulteræ quærat amplexus." Epist. lxxxiii. ad Ocean. The fathers often represent churches as the spouses of bishops, whose unions cannot be dissolved.

† Ap. Labbe, tom. iii. col. 757.

antiquity could hardly have been ignorant that even such usurpations as the Council of Ephesus condemns, may become so established as to pass into laws, and be sanctioned by canons. If he be acquainted with the history of the see of Constantinople, he would have remembered how that see, originally a suffragan of Heraclea, by a series of usurpations, obtained jurisdiction over the Metropolitans of Pontus, Thrace, and Asia, which at length was approved by the general council of Chalcedon. And though, through the refusal of Pope Leo to sanction some of the canons of that synod, the arrogant pretensions of that see against the rights of other patriarchates were repressed, yet it is evident that its jurisdiction as a Patriarchal See over the once *autocephali*, or independent metropolitans above-named, was from thenceforward admitted.\*

Secondly : But if on the one hand the reasoning of the tract-writer be delusive and incorrect, when he argues from any general assertion of rights in an ancient, though œcumenical council, that such rights are unalienable (of the particular application of this case to England I shall treat later), we on the other hand are justified in concluding from this example, that any jurisdiction, even though it might have been originally unjust and usurped, which any patriarchate obtained, might, by long usage and willing submission, become legitimated, and so form a part of the ecclesiastical law. For the council of Chalcedon does not *grant* but *admit* rights as already existing : "Let not the privileges of Constantinople be lost." But if we search this important matter closer, for it brings us very near our final purpose, we shall come to still more specific conclusions. For both from the instance just given of Constantinople, and from the very one quoted from the Tracts, of Cyprus, it clearly follows that the subjection to, or exemption from, jurisdiction, so completely depended upon consuetude and the actual and tolerated exercise of power, that this acquired the force of canon law. 1. For, when the legates of the Holy See had protested against the subscriptions which they thought had been artfully extorted from the Pontic and Asiatic bishops during their absence from the synod, and insisted that the very canon of Nicea, quoted by the Tracts,† should here prevail, as securing to these Churches their independence, the fathers required that all who had signed the decrees in question should say whether they had been compelled to subscribe, or had done it of their own free will. In answering to this appeal, several of the bishops assign as their grounds for subjection to the patriarchal rights of Constantinople, that custom had sanctioned it. Thus Seleucus, bishop of Amasia,

---

\* Thomassin, tom. 1. p. 38. It must be observed too that the independence of Ephesus (metropolis of Asia) was attributed to its having been the see of John, and consequently was as old as the Church.

† *Ubi supra*. The Canon is in these words, as translated in the Tracts : "Let the ancient usages prevail, which are received in Egypt, Lybia and Pentapolis, relative to the authority of the bishop of Alexandria ; as they are observed in the case of the Bishop of Rome ; and so in Antioch, too, and other provinces, let the prerogatives of the Churches be preserved." I do not intend to subscribe to this version, by quoting it.



says, "before me three bishops were consecrated by this see, and finding this series, I followed it. And now I have made it (the subscription) voluntarily, wishing to be under this see." Peter of Gangræ said, "before me three were consecrated by the bishop of the imperial city, and I likewise after them. Therefore I have consented, having custom for it." Marinianus of Synnadi, and Critæianus of Aphrodisia, give the same reason. Eusebius of Dorylæum assigns as his motive, that the Pope had approved of this practice in presence of some Constantinopolitan clergy. His words deserve to be quoted: "Ἐκὼν ὑπεγράψα, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ΤΟΝ ΚΑΝΟΝΑ ΤΟΥΤΟΝ τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ πάπῳ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐγὼ ἀνεγνων, παρόντων τῶν κληρικῶν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, καὶ ἀπεδέξατο αὐτόν." "I have willingly subscribed, since I referred THIS CANON to the most holy Pope in Rome, in the presence of the clergy of Constantinople, and he accepted it." Eleutherius of Chalcedon said that the See of Constantinople held its superior authority by the canons and custom.\* Now certainly the canons of Nicea and Ephesus (as the tract-writer, at least, will allow) forbade this assumption of superiority: we find, therefore, that custom, long and peaceably established, prevailed in the minds of these bishops against those canons: and the general council acquiesced in their opinion. For the claims of Constantinople were held good, and ever after prevailed. The *canon*, therefore, mentioned by Eusebius of Dorylæum could mean no more than the *rule* introduced by custom, which had thus acquired canonical authority.

[Since the above was written, I have fallen in with the candid acknowledgment of one of the tract-writers, as to the unfairness of the reasoning here used concerning the canon of Ephesus. I allude to the remarks of the late Mr. Froude, in one of his letters to Mr. Newman, written towards the close of his life. He writes as follows: "The other day accidentally put in my way the tract on *the Apostolical succession in the English Church*; and it really does seem so very unfair, that I wonder you could, even in the extremity of οἰκονομία and φενακισμός, have consented to be a party to it. The Patriarchate of Constantinople, as every one knows, was not one 'from the first;' but neighbouring churches voluntarily submitted to it in the first instance, and then, by virtue of their oaths, remained its ecclesiastical subjects; and the same argument by which you justify England and Ireland, would justify all those churches in setting up any day for themselves. The obvious meaning of the canon (of Ephesus) is, that patriarchs might not *begin* to exercise authority in churches *hitherto* independent, without their consent."—*Froude's Remains*, vol. ii. pp. 425-6.]

---

\* Ap. Labbe, tom. iv. col. 813-815. The only canons recited as bearing upon the point were that of Nicea securing the rights of Churches, and one of the synod of Constantinople, under Nestorius, which expressly acknowledges the αυτοκεφαλία of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace. These certainly could not be the *canons* alluded to, and yet no other canon, properly so called, could be supposed to bear upon the point.—*Ubi supra*, col. 811.

2. The instance quoted by the Tracts is still more to our purpose. The Patriarch of Antioch claimed the right of ordaining the bishops of Cyprus, or of authorizing their ordination. These opposed his pretensions and appealed to the council of Ephesus. The fathers there assembled prudently investigated the patriarch's right to interference, which they did as follows. The holy synod said, "What does the Bishop of Antioch wish?"—Evagrius of Sola, "He attempts to subject our island, and seize the right of ordaining, contrary to the *canons and custom which is now ancient*." The holy synod, "Was the Bishop of Antioch ever known to consecrate a bishop in Constantia?"—Zeno of Curium, "*From the apostles' time it cannot be shewn, that the Patriarch of Antioch was present and ordained, OR EVER COMMUNICATED TO THE ISLAND THE GRACE OF ORDERS, nor yet any one else*." The holy synod, "Let the holy synod remember the canon of the holy fathers, in Nicea assembled, which secures to each Church its *pristine dignity*. . . Inform us, therefore, HAD NOT THE BISHOP OF ANTIOCH THE RIGHT OF ORDAINING YOU FROM ANCIENT CUSTOM?"—Zeno said, "We have already affirmed that he never was present nor ordained, either in the metropolis or in any other city."\* After this interrogatory comes the decree given in the Tract.†

Any unprejudiced reader, upon perusing this interrogatory, will, we think, conclude that, had the Cyprian bishops been unable to state, that till then the Antiochian patriarch had not ordained bishops in their island, such a decree would not have been granted. Twice the synod insists upon an explicit answer to this question, not to ascertain what right the patriarch put forward, nor how he supported it, but simply to learn whether or no an ancient custom prevailed, of the bishops of Antioch exerting patriarchal rights over the nomination of the Cyprian prelates. Moreover, canons, and customs become ancient, are put on a level, and the latter receive the same force as the former. The preamble to the decree, as given in the Tracts, confirms all that we have said: for it says, "*whereas it is against ancient usage that the Bishop of Antioch should ordain in Cyprus*, as has been proved to us in this council, both in words and in writing, by most orthodox men, we THEREFORE decree that the prelates of the Cyprian Churches shall be suffered, without let or hindrance, to consecrate bishops by themselves; and, moreover, that the same rule shall be observed also in other dioceses and provinces everywhere, so that no bishop shall interfere in another province, WHICH HAS NOT FROM THE VERY FIRST BEEN UNDER HIMSELF AND HIS PREDECESSORS." Is it not evident that the decree supposes that no patriarchal jurisdiction had existed *de facto* in that island: nay, that it sanctions the principle, that where such exercise of jurisdiction exists, it has the force of law?

The examples and authorities thus far recited, lead us to these conclusions. First, the Church has from the beginning held that

\* Ap. Labbe, tom. iii. col. 800.

† Ib. col. 801.

a bishop, however validly consecrated, if placed in possession of a see contrary to the canons actually in force in the Church, or by means contrary to those regulations which it considers essential to legitimate nomination, acquired no jurisdiction in or over it, and did not enjoy a part in that apostolical succession, which can only be transmitted through legitimate occupation. Secondly, that the canons appointing the forms of such legitimate occupation, or the bars thereto, were not particularly those of Nicea, but generally such as the Church agreed in at a given time. Thirdly, that patriarchal jurisdiction is legitimated and determined by usage, and that this sanctions it with a force equal to that of canons.

Let us now come to the practical application of these principles, to the case of the English and Irish hierarchies. My readers will have seen what liberal terms I have granted my adversaries, in this dispute. Till now I have allowed them to assume what I could have justly denied,—the validity of their orders. I am going to extend my concessions further still, *for the present*. For I am going to confine the rights of the sovereign Pontiff in England to those of his patriarchate, excluding the consideration of his supremacy. Nay, I am not unwilling even to go further still: and, if the inquiry could be thereby shortened, I would allow my antagonists the false plea of original usurpation on his part. For the cases of Constantinople, in the matter of Thrace, Pontus, and Asia, and of Cyprus *versus* Antioch, have established the principle, that possession and ancient usage constitute a right to patriarchal jurisdiction,—all inquiry into its origin being waived.

Let us, therefore, suppose a general council to have to decide by those *fixed laws* to which the Tracts appeal, upon the value of Anglican jurisdiction in the sees of England, and the right of the royal, or parliamentary bishops, to apostolical succession, denied to them by the See of Rome. Let the inquiry be conducted on the principles and in the forms used in the ancient synods, as Ephesus or Chalcedon. It might be as follows:—

THE ACCUSATION. “The apostolic See charges those who call themselves the archbishops and bishops of the Church established in England and Ireland, with being intruders, by favour of the civil power, into the sees of those realms; inasmuch as they and their predecessors took possession thereof in spite, and to the detriment, of the patriarchal rights of that See, which, from the canons and immemorial usage, had been exercised in the nomination or approbation of all metropolitans and bishops. Up to the time of King Henry VIII, this right was perfectly acquiesced in; when, by his statute 25 Hen. VIII, c. 20, the nomination by letters missive was reserved to the king, all the authority of the apostolic See being set aside. The bishops so ordained were removed by the authority of Queen Mary, as competent to interfere in such matters as the king her father. But, moreover, what she did was with the full concurrence and approbation of this apostolic See, which reclaimed and resumed

its rights, as before acknowledged, and, therefore, was in exact conformity to ecclesiastical law. After which, Elizabeth expelled the bishops who were in peaceable possession of their sees, with the consent of the Holy See and of the Crown; and so substituted, by her own private authority, other so-called bishops, from whom the present pretenders to apostolical succession follow and succeed.\* Such subversion of the rights, long holden and admitted, of this apostolical see, and such assumption of a power never admitted in any part of the Church, were clear infringements of the canon, and constitute an act of usurpation and intrusion, which is null and void in all its consequences."

THE REJOINDER. "The archbishops and bishops of England and Ireland, reply to this charge, by denying that the Bishop of Rome, although he was 'the first of the patriarchs in dignity,' and 'might be called the honorary primate of all Christendom,' possessed any lawful jurisdiction in their countries. For they say, that in Scripture there is not a word to sanction the assumption on his part of such authority as he exercised for so many ages.† Hence, at the Reformation, 'there was no new Church founded amongst us, but *the rights* and the doctrines of the ancient existing Church were asserted and re-established. In proof of this, we need only look at the history of the times. In the year 1534, the bishops and clergy of England assembled in their respective convocations of Canterbury and York, and signed a declaration, that the Pope, or Bishop of Rome, had no more jurisdiction in this country, by the Word of God, than any other foreign bishop."‡

---

\* Whoever will take the trouble of running through Godwin's "*De præsulibus Anglicanis*," see by see, will find the following results. Succeeded by royal appointment to sees vacant, the Archbishop of Canterbury, bishops of Salisbury, Norwich, Chichester, Gloucester, Bristol, Bangor, Hereford,—eight. Succeeded by the expulsion of bishops in pacific and legal possession, never having before held the sees to which they were preferred, Archbishop of York, bishops of London, Winchester, Ely, Lincoln, Litchfield and Coventry, Bath and Wells, Exeter, Worcester, Rochester, St. David's, St. Asaph's, Durham, Peterborough, Carlisle, Chester,—sixteen. Retained in the see he occupied, Bishop of Llandaff (*Fundi nostri calamitas*, Godw.),—one. Barlow, deposed from Bath and Wells, under Mary, was named Bishop of Chichester; and Scorey, formerly of Chichester, received Hereford: as if to disprove the bold assertion of the Tracts, that, on the succession of Queen Elizabeth, the true successors of the Apostles in the English Church were reinstated in their rights!"—(Tr. xv. p. 4.) Not a single bishop was reinstated in a see of which he had been deprived. Compare Dodd, vol. ii. p. 7.

† There is an unaccountable inconsistency in the appeal made by the Tract-writer to ecclesiastical decisions, while the original separation from the Holy See proceeded exclusively on the grounds which he also lays down, that *Scripture* gives to the Bishop of Rome no more authority in England than it does to any other foreign bishop. The act of convocation of the province of Canterbury in 1534, the opinion of the University of Cambridge, and the king's proclamation for abolishing the supremacy, omit all mention of ecclesiastical usage, and only discuss the question of divine right as granted in Scripture. Wilkins's *Concilia*, 1738, tom. iii. pp. 769, 771, 772. Are these the grounds on which Ephesus or Chalcedon would have conducted the inquiry?

‡ It is lamentable to hear such men as compose these Tracts, admitting as free,

THE LAW AND PRECEDENTS. I do not recollect a single instance in an Œcumenical Synod, where the decision as to the rights of the Patriarch of Antioch or Alexandria, to exercise jurisdiction over bishops of other countries,—as of Lybia, Pentapolis, or Cyprus,—and to confirm or depose them, was based upon the inquiry whether he had more jurisdiction *by the Word of God*, than any other foreign bishop. But we have found it to be the prevailing practice, when appeal was made to general councils in matters of disputed rights (as our Tract-writers here have made), for the fathers, before proceeding to examine the question of fact, to desire those canons and precedents to be recited which could establish the rights of parties in the case before them. I might, therefore, reasonably suppose such to be the proceeding here. The καθωσιωµένος μαγιστρίανός καὶ σηκητάριος τοῦ θείου κοινοστωπλοῦ\* might be supposed to read as follows:—

1. “The decrees of the Great and Holy Councils. The celebrated rule of the First Nicene Council, A.D. 325.....*Let the ancient usages prevail, which are received in Egypt, &c., as they are observed in the case of the Bishop of Rome.*” (Tr. *ibid.* p. 8.)†

The decree of Ephesus. “The same rule shall be observed also in other dioceses and provinces every where, so that no bishop shall interfere in other provinces, *which has not from the very first been under himself and his predecessors.*”—*ib.* p. 7.

2. Proofs of the rights of Patriarchs to ordain and confirm the Metropolitans, and through them all the bishops of their patriarchate. St. Athanasius of Alexandria expressly tells us, that he exercised this right by ordaining many bishops.‡ The Council of Nicea expressly enjoined that for any of the Meletian bishops to be raised to a see, it was necessary to have canonical election by the clergy and people, and the confirmation of the Patriarch of Alexandria.§ The general Council of Chalcedon decreed that the Patriarch of Constantinople should have the power of consecrating the metropolitans of Pontus and Asia.|| The celebrated epistle of Pope Innocent I to Alexander, Patriarch of Antioch, explains the canon of Nicea as admitting this right in patriarchs. “Whence we remark,” he writes, “that this (patriarchal dignity) was given to Antioch, not so much on account of the magnificence of the city, as because it is proved to have been the first see of the first Apostle, where the

---

deliberate acts of the clergy, what they tremblingly performed by King Henry's stern command, with the fate of Fisher and More as the alternative of refusal; what formed the sequel of a series of measures taken by the tyrant to secure possession of the object of his lust, and what the most influential members of those convocations, including the royal pander Cranmer himself, afterwards retracted.

\* So the secretary is styled in the acts of the council.

† On the interpretation of this canon, see De la Mennais, “Tradition de l'Eglise sur l'institution des évêques,” Liège, 1814, vol. ii. pp. 81 seqq.; the work by which alone it were well if its author could be known to posterity.

‡ Epist. ad Dracont. ap. Hallier, de Sacris. Ordin. Paris, 1636, p. 771.

§ Epist. Conc. Nic. ad Eccles. Alex. Labbe, tom. ii. col. 251.

|| Can. 28, *ib.* tom. iv. col. 769.

Christian religion received its name, and was worthy of having a celebrated meeting of the Apostles; which would not be second to the See of Rome, but that it only enjoyed temporarily (*in transitu*) what this had the happiness to receive and fully to possess. Therefore, beloved brother, we think, that as, by peculiar authority, you ordain all metropolitans, so you should not allow other bishops to be appointed without your permission and approbation. On which matter this will be the proper course for you to take, that you should, by letters, authorize such as are at a great distance to be ordained by those who now do it by their own judgment; and those who are near, if you think right, you should bring to receive consecration at your own hands.\* This decree or letter assumes for its foundation the fact, that the patriarch consecrated metropolitans in his jurisdiction.

3. Proofs that the nomination of bishops, without the sanction of their respective patriarchs, was null as to jurisdiction. Hitherto I have contented myself with concluding that the infringement of the canon law invalidated the legitimacy of consecration. Direct proofs are not wanting to show, that the want of the patriarch's assent produced a fatal flaw in the title to a see. Synesius writes that the ordination of the bishops of Palœleisca and Hydrax were invalid, because they had not been confirmed by the Patriarch of Alexandria.† Again, when the people of Olbium had elected a bishop, and three prelates, of whom Synesius was one, had given their assent, he writes to the patriarch that only his approbation was wanting to complete the work.‡ In fine, to omit many other proofs, the eighth general council, the fourth of Constantinople, having recited the canon of Nicea, orders that *the ancient custom* be preserved, whereby the *Patriarchs* of Rome, Antioch, and Jerusalem might summon to council, or visit and correct *all metropolitans who are appointed by them, and who whether by imposition of hands, or by gift of the pallium, RECEIVE VALIDITY IN THEIR EPISCOPAL DIGNITY.*§

4. Proofs that the Roman pontiffs were patriarchs of the West, and exercised patriarchal rights over it, England included. St. Jerome says, "Let them condemn me as a heretic with the WEST, as a heretic WITH EGYPT, that is with Damasus (of Rome) and with Peter" (of Alexandria).|| That is, as the learned and most judicious De Marca observes, the pope is placed in the same relation

\* Epist. Innoc. I ad Alex. ap. Constant. Epist. R. P. col. 851.

† Epist. 67 ad Theophil. ap. Morinam. Exercitat. Eccles. et Bib. p. 84.

‡ Ep. 76, ap. eund.

§ After reciting the Nicene canon, "quâ pro causâ et hæc magna et sancta Synodus tam in seniori et novâ Româ quam in sede Antiochiæ ac Hierosolymorum prisecam consuetudinem decernit in omnibus conservari. Ita ut earum præsules universorum Metropolitanorum qui ab ipsis promoventur et sive per manûs impositionem sive per pallii dationem episcopalis dignitatis firmitatem accipiunt, habeant potestatem, videlicet ad convocandum eos, urgente necessitate ad synodalem conventum, vel etiam ad coercendum illos et colligendum," &c. Conc. Labbe, tom. viii. col. 1135.

|| Epist. xv. Oper. S. Hier. tom. iv par. ii. col. 21.

to the entire west as the Alexandrian patriarch is to Egypt, that is, as its patriarch;\* having therefore precisely as much right to exercise jurisdiction in the nomination of his metropolitans: and consequently any of these is without jurisdiction, if uncanonically nominated against his will. When the emperor Justinian wished to honour with a high ecclesiastical dignity the Bishop of Achridus, his native place, giving it the name of *Justiniana prima*, he applied to Pope Vigilius, who erected it into an archiepiscopal and metropolitan see, assigning it a province which he took from that of Thessalonica.† And hence St. Gregory the Great expressly and directly confirms the nomination of John, elected to that see, sending him the pallium in token thereof.‡ Again, when Perigenes had been ordained bishop of Patras in 418, and the people had refused to admit him, he was elected to the *metropolitan* see of Corinth, his native city. The clergy and people sent a petition to Pope Boniface I, requesting him to confirm their choice. He first sent their memorial to his vicar, the Archbishop of Thessalonica, with orders to enquire into the case, and make a report thereon. Upon receiving this, the Pope confirmed the election, in terms demonstrative that such confirmation was necessary for the validity of the appointment.§ Socrates, who relates this event, says expressly that Perigenes was named bishop by command of the Holy See.||

For proofs that the Pope exercised patriarchal authority over the other countries of the west, as France, Spain, Africa, and the rest, and the parts of Italy beyond the immediate province of Rome, I must refer my readers to the great writers on these points, or to the *Tradition de l'Eglise*, where they are admirably condensed.¶ I pass on to precedents more immediately connected with my enquiry.

The Church of Germany is an instance parallel to that of England, being a Church formed in a country converted to the faith, by missionaries from the See of Rome. St. Boniface, its first great apostle, had received episcopal consecration from Pope Gregory II. Gregory III sent him the pallium, and empowered him to nominate and consecrate bishops “by the authority of the apostolic see.”\*\* He did so, and divided Bavaria into four bishoprics; and having founded others in Franconia and Thuringia, he wrote to the pope for letters of confirmation for each bishop, which the pope readily sent them.††

I will content myself here with one single proof that England was considered a part of the Roman, or Western patriarchate; others will be better introduced later. When Constantine Pogonatus

\* De Concord. Sacerd. et imper. lib. i. c. v. n. 2. Tradition de l'Eglise, tom. ii. p. 21.

+ Novell. cxxxii.

† Epist. xxii. Oper. S. Greg. t. ii. col. 585, ed. Bened.

‡ “Cui (Perigine) ad plenitudinem confirmationis episcopatus sui hoc solum residet quod nostros in honore suo necdum suscepit affatus.”—Epist. v. Bonif. I. ap. Const. col. 1023.

¶ H. E. lib. vii. c. 36.

¶ Vol. ii. from p. 78 to the end of the volume.

\*\* Concil. Labbe, tom. vi. coll. 1437-1468. †† Tradit. de l'Eglise, p. 235.

wished to convene a general council, he wrote to Pope Donus requesting him to send three legates; or if those were not sufficient, as many more as he thought proper. Agatho, Donus's successor, replied, that there had been a delay in complying with the emperor's desire, from the extent of the provinces whereof his council was composed. For it must be observed that besides the papal legates, the emperor had requested a deputation consisting of about twelve metropolitans and bishops to attend the synod, as representatives of the council of Rome, that is, of the provinces more immediately subject to its jurisdiction. Now, among the subscriptions to the synod holden at Rome on this occasion, we find that of Wilfrid, Archbishop of York, as well as of Felix of Arles, and other French bishops. Then, therefore all belonged to the patriarchal council of the Bishop of Rome. Moreover, in their letter to the emperor, the bishops give as a reason for delay, that they had hoped to be joined by "Theodore, Archbishop of the great island of Britain and a philosopher, together with other bishops dwelling in that island, and divers prelates of their council dispersed in different parts, that so their suggestions might be made by their entire council."\* It is an ancient maxim of ecclesiastical law, as De Marca has observed, "qui pertinent ad consecrationem, pertinent ad synodum;"† that is, only those could be summoned to a synod, over whom he who summons has right of consecration, the two rights of commanding attendance and of consecrating being commensurate. This is further proved by the canon above cited at length, of the eighth general council, (which, even to those who do not allow it to be œcumenical, must have a weighty historical authority) in which it was stated that the *ancient custom*, (referred by it to the decrees of the Nicene council,) be observed, in virtue whereof the patriarch of Rome, like other patriarchs, might summon the metropolitans subject to him to a council. Seeing, therefore, that Theodore of Canterbury and other English were called to, and expected to attend, this Roman or Western council, as forming part thereof, and that Wilfrid of York being in Rome did attend it, we may justly conclude that they were subject to the patriarchal authority of the Roman See, which summoned them. Such might be, in an abridged form, the recital of laws and precedents bearing upon the decision of the question.

**THE INTERROGATORY.**—In the ancient synods, the laws having been read, the parties were interrogated, and of course expected to give their replies according to the truth of facts. We might, therefore, suppose such questions put as were at the enquiry into the claims of the Patriarch of Antioch. The synod would interrogate, and the defenders of the Anglican Church reply.

*The Synod.* "Who planted the Christian religion in your country?" —*The Anglican Church* "The venerable Bede informs us, that Pope Eleutherius sent over missionaries to the Britons, and converted them.‡ And when the Pelagian heresy had infected the

\* Concil. Labbe, tom. vi. col. 685.

† De Concord, lib. i. c. vii. n. 3

‡ Historia Ecclesiastica, lib. i. c. 4.



island, Pope Celestine sent St. Germanus to correct and purify it."—*The Synod*. "Who communicated to your island the grace of orders?"\*—*The Anglican Church*. "The holy Pope St. Gregory, who reconverted our island under the Anglo-Saxons, and established in it the episcopacy which yet remains. For he appointed St. Augustine Archbishop of London (which see he transferred to Canterbury), sending him the pallium, with power to consecrate twelve bishops as his suffragans, and another bishop at York, who should also consecrate twelve suffragans, receiving likewise the pallium, and enjoying the dignity of metropolitan. The pope also disposed, that during Augustine's lifetime, the Archbishop of York should be subject to him, but after the death of that apostle enjoy independence. The two metropolitans were to have precedence according to seniority of consecration."†—*The Synod*. "Did the Bishop of Rome continue to exercise jurisdiction over the metropolitans of England and Ireland after their first establishment?"—*The Anglican Church*. "Most certainly; for Honorius I, writing to King Edwin, sends the pallium to the two archbishops, with special powers to either to name the other's successor, *in virtue of the authority of the Holy See*, in consideration of the great distance which separates England from Rome.‡ Pope Adrian, acceding to the wish of Offa, king of the Mercians, created the Bishop of Lichfield primate, subjecting to him many of the suffragans of Canterbury. The Archbishop of this see submitted, however reluctantly, to the dismemberment of his province, till Leo III, better informed, acceded to the petition of the bishops, and rescinded his predecessor's decree.§ During the long contests for superiority between the sees of Canterbury and York, the matter was constantly referred to Rome, and its legates presided at the British synods held concerning their respective claims. The alternate triumphs of the contending parties were due to papal decisions in favour of one or the other.|| In Ireland it was the same. St. Malachi, Archbishop of Armagh, because, as

---

\* Conc. Chalced. sup. cit.

† "Usum pallii tibi concedimus, ita ut per loca singula duodecim Episcopos ordines qui tuæ ditioni subiaceant; quatenus Londinensis civitatis episcopus semper in posterum à synodo propriâ debeat consecrari, atque honoris pallium ab hac apostolicâ sede percipiat. Ad Eboracam verò civitatem te volumus episcopum mittere, ut ipse quoque duodecim episcopos ordinet, ut Metropolitani honore perfruatur, quia ei quoque pallium tribuere disponimus, quem tamen tuæ fraternitatis volumus dispositioni subjacere. Post obitum verò tuum ita episcopis quos ordinaverit præsit, ut Londoniensis Episcopi nullo modo ditioni subjaceat. Sit verò inter Londoniæ et Eboracæ civitatis in posterum honoris ista distinctio, ut ipse prior habeatur, qui primus fuerit ordinatus."—Epist. lxx. lib. xi. Oper. S. Greg. tom. ii. col. 1162. Here we have a similar expression to the one mentioned above; the synod or council of a *metropolitan* is evidently the collection of the bishops whom he has the right of consecrating.

‡ Conc. Labbe, tom. v. col. 1683.

§ Matt. Westm. p. 276. William of Malmsb. p. 30.

|| Those who wish to read a detailed narrative of these distressing disputes will find it in Thomassin, *Vetus et Nova Ecclesiæ Disciplina*. Par. i. lib. i. c. xxxvi. tom. i. pp. 121-126.

St. Bernard writes, '*metropolitice sedi deerat adhuc et defuerat pallii usus, quod est plenitudo honoris*,' undertook a journey to Rome to obtain this distinction for himself, and for another new archiepiscopal see, the erection whereof he moreover desired to have confirmed by the Holy See. § In 1151, Eugenius III sent four palliums into Ireland, appointing four metropolitans, to each of whom five suffragans were to be subject. This, says Hoveden, was an infringement of the rights of Canterbury, 'from which the bishops of Ireland had used to ask and receive the blessing of consecration.' || We acknowledge, therefore, that the see of Rome did from the beginning order our hierarchy, such as it now exists, and transfer, divide, or otherwise vary, the jurisdiction of our metropolitans."—*The Synod*. "Was the Bishop of Rome ever known to consecrate an Archbishop of Canterbury? . . . Let the holy synod remember the canon of the holy fathers in Nicea assembled, which secures to *each* church its *pristine dignity*. . . Inform us, therefore, had not the Bishop of Rome the *right* of ordaining you from ancient custom?" ¶ —*The Anglican Church*. "We cannot deny that the Bishop of Rome has, either by himself or others, ordained and confirmed our metropolitans. After St. Augustine and his immediate successors, appointed in virtue of authority from the apostolic see, other examples occur. Thus Egbert, king of Kent, and Oswi, of Northumbria, sent Wigard to Rome, as Venerable Bede informs us, to be consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury by Pope Vitalianus; but he dying at Rome, the holy pontiff named, consecrated, and sent over, Theodore, in 668.\* We have evidence also of confirmation in early times, as of Justus by Boniface V, who granted the archbishop power to consecrate other bishops,† and of St. Dunstan, whom Pope John confirmed and appointed his vicar.‡ In later times there could be no doubt that such superior jurisdiction was exercised."—*The Synod*. "Was such jurisdiction willingly submitted to, or was it disturbed by protests, complaints, or otherwise?"—*The Anglican Church*. "Although the clergy constantly complained of papal provisions, whereby vacant benefices were filled up by the Court of Rome with strangers, we never read of any denial of the pope's authority to confirm archbishops, by sending them the pallium, or of his jurisdiction over them, or of his having a legate in England, who took precedence, and judged their decisions. Till the time of Henry VIII the patriarchal privileges and rights of the Holy See were never impugned or disputed."

THE DECREE.—After hearing the parties, a decree would have to

§ In vitâ Malachie ap. Baron. ad an. 1137, et Thomass. ubi supr.

|| Thomass. *ibid.* p. 125. We do not stay to inquire into the truth of this statement; we quote it only as a proof of the acknowledged jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff.

¶ Conc. Chalced. *supr. cit.*

\* Bede, lib. iii. cap. 29. As I am treating this question on its lowest possible footing, I do not cite in the text the reason given by the two monarchs for wishing to have the archbishop consecrated at Rome; "*quia Romana esse Catholica et apostolica ecclesia.*"

† Conc. Labbe, tom. v. col. 1658.

‡ Eadmer. *Hist. Nov. lib. iv.*

be passed, based upon the canons and usages of the Church, as applied to the case under discussion. The preamble would have to state, "that the decrees of councils secure to each church its pristine dignity, and to the patriarchates their established jurisdiction; That ecclesiastical authority had ever held those episcopal nominations of no value, towards conferring apostolical succession or place in the hierarchy, which were made in contravention of the canons in force in the Church; That these canons, as established by *long usage*, gave to the Holy See the *right* of nominating or confirming the metropolitans of England; That the order of bishops now existing in England, even supposing the validity of their orders, was instituted and appointed, the bishop of Rome not only not consentient but repugnant thereto, and vehemently condemning the same, as an infringement of his immemorial rights, secured to him by the canons and customs become ancient." Therefore the synod, unless it turned its back upon all former decisions of the Church, and all its standing laws, would be obliged to decide: "That the bishops, who now hold, by authority of law, the sees of England, have not, and never have had, since the Reformation, any ecclesiastical, hierarchical, or apostolical succession, authority, or jurisdiction whatever, in matters religious or spiritual; That they are not the inheritors or successors of those who held the sees until that time; That consequently they are, in the eyes of the Church Catholic, intruders, usurpers, and illegitimate holders of the same."

Such must have been the decision of an ancient synod, had the validity of Anglican claims to apostolical succession or ecclesiastical authority, been proposed to it: and such is the judgment to which any one conversant with the principles of ecclesiastical antiquity and law, and willing to abide by them, must likewise come. Whatever pre-eminence, privilege, or jurisdiction, the civil legislature of the country can bestow upon its functionaries, and whatever, in such capacity, it may have bestowed upon the ministers of the English Church, we willingly allow and will pay them. Whether it be to frank a letter, or give probate to a will, to commit a poacher or vote in the House of Lords, let them enjoy it; we envy and grudge them not. But believe there is benediction in their blessing more than any other man's, lawful order or consecration in the laying on of their hands, more than of a layman's, we do not and cannot, without renouncing all respect for antiquity, and all veneration for our fathers in the faith.

After this clear exposition of my motives, I shall not, of course, be suspected of having yielded too much, or placed the rights of the Holy See upon too low a ground. I have certainly given up much. I have discussed the matter as one of ecclesiastical right rather than of divine; and have shewn, that even thus, the jurisdiction and succession claimed by the Tracts for their Church is null. But, in fact, it would be in my power to show, that such rights as the apostolic See held, and yet does hold, over the episcopacy of the Church, are not of ecclesiastical origin, but belong essentially to the Chair of Peter,

as granted to it by our Lord himself. This leads me to another and a much higher ground, on which to base any resistance to the pretensions of the English Church and its upholders to be an apostolical establishment, or "a branch," as they choose to call it, "of the Catholic Church:" a ground, too, which still dispenses with all inquiry into the validity of Anglican ordination. I mean, THE STATE OF SCHISM into which it put itself at the Reformation, and which at once acted as a blight upon all its ecclesiastical powers, withering them, and rendering them incapable of any act of valid jurisdiction, or any place in the apostolical succession. This portion of my argument, with many other matters connected with this subject, I reserve for the next number. I shall treat it by the light of ecclesiastical antiquity, and exhibit instances curiously parallel with that of the Anglo-Hibernian establishment.

But there is an argument, or objection, or insinuation, in the Tract so often alluded to, that calls for my notice before concluding this portion of my task. It consists in the remark quoted above, that the bishops appointed by Mary were usurpers, and that, "on the succession of Queen Elizabeth, the true successors of the Apostles in the English Church were reinstated in their rights." As I am in my granting vein to-day, I am disposed, for argument's sake, to suppose that the bishops put into the English sees under Mary *were* intruded, though the canons in force in the Church and in England, till Henry violated them, were observed in their appointment. And even so I ask, WHO deposed them? WHO reinstated the others? WHO *were* reinstated? for these are matters requiring ample explanation, before any but the rude and simple will acquiesce in the assertion of the writer. WHO removed Mary's, or rather the Roman Pontiff's bishops? Did the English Church? Who formed this Church, if the sixteen deposed bishops did not? But what act was there that could be called an act of the English Church, removing one archbishop and fifteen bishops, leaving *one* in his see, omitting another (Coverdale) who had been deposed by Mary, and placing *two* others in sees which they had not before occupied? Parker, the new metropolitan, could not be said to reinstate, nor to form the hierarchy, not being himself consecrated. And if, as these writers pretend, at the Reformation a return was made to the ancient rules, and the Anglican Church only vindicated its rights as accorded to every Church by the early councils, let them shew us the canons whereby the deprivation of bishops, and the appointment of new ones by letters missive, are granted to the civil rulers. But we will easily shew them those whereby the election of a metropolitan is reserved to his synod or provincials; and we will prove to them that it was a mutual understanding between the Holy See and temporal princes, which granted to the latter, in modern times, the power of nomination, subject to confirmation from the former. Let them be, therefore, consistent. If they allow the authority of Elizabeth to act as she did, let them admit that of Mary to act similarly: and, moreover, let them give us their warrant for

such authority, in the ancient Church to which they appeal. If they consider it to have been a usurpation in Elizabeth "of the iron hand and of the iron maw," as some of them have called her, then is their entire hierarchy based upon an unjustifiable and tyrannical act of power, and they who compose it are intruders. They are not shepherds who enter in by the door. It is precisely the case of Gregory, whom the Emperor Constantius thrust into the see of Alexandria, the true bishop yet living; of whom St. Athanasius thus writes:—"His reason for thus acting was, that he was neither consecrated according to the ecclesiastical canon, nor called to be a bishop according to apostolical tradition; but sent from the palace with a military force and pomp, as though he had received a civil magistracy."\* Such, if judged by the ancient laws of the Church, and such in fact, were the Anglican prelates, named contrary to apostolical tradition, ordained contrary to the canons of the Church, nominees of the palace, thrust into the sees of bishops first imprisoned and deposed by the arm of secular power, and willing to receive episcopacy as though it had been a mere civil dignity. And such, in fact, it is;—they have received but a civil magistracy. And hence the Council of Sardica pronounced Gregory to be no true bishop, deposing him from the place to which the secular arm had raised him.† We think it needless to urge our last question, *Who were reinstated?* for the answer is plain, **NOT ONE.** Kitchen of Llandaff was not,—for he had never been removed. Barlow and Scorey were not,—for they never took possession of the sees in which alone they could have kept up succession. Parker and the new creation were not,—for they had never been bishops nor held sees before.

But let us follow up the inquiry into the matter upon those principles which have hitherto guided us,—the laws of the Church as displayed in its conduct. Bassianus having been consecrated, against his will, Bishop of Evazi, refused to proceed thither. Upon a vacancy in the see of his native city, Ephesus, he violently thrust himself into it, and kept peaceable possession of it for four years. After this period, Stephanus, a priest of the same Church, assisted by a party, seized his person, and was elected bishop in his place, to all appearance by the consent of the province. The case between these two claimants for the metropolitan see, was heard and decided by the Council of Chalcedon in its eleventh action. Bassianus was charged with irregularity in having been translated from his former see. He replied, that he had never been lawfully appointed, and had never gone to it; and that Basil, successor to Memnon, who had violently consecrated him bishop, had recognized the illegality of the act, and restored him "the place and communion of a bishop:"‡ another proof of episcopal rank without jurisdiction. He was then called on to state who gave him possession of his see. He

\* Epist. ad Solitar. n. 14.

† Epist. Synod. ad Eccles. Alex. ap. Labbe. tom. i. c. 667.

‡ Conc. Labbe, tom. iv. col. 687.

acknowledged that only one bishop of the province was there; who, however, when appealed to, stated that he was compelled by a mob to give him institution. Here was a manifest irregularity, sufficient to vitiate the appointment, as he himself acknowledged. However, he had interposed a plea that he had been acknowledged and confirmed by Proclus, Patriarch of Constantinople. The judges ask the Constantinopolitan clergy there present, to inform the council if this were true. Theophilus, one of them, replied that it was, and that Proclus had communicated with Bassianus as Bishop of Ephesus. The tables now seemed turned; and Stephanus was called on to prove how Bassianus had been removed (*ἀποκηθέντα*). We see, therefore, that the confirmation by the patriarch had the force of canonical institution, and even compensated irregularities and violations of the canons in the election. What authority, then, was greater even than this, and could reverse its decisions? *That of the Roman Pontiff*. Stephanus thus replies:—"The matter was referred to the Patriarch of Antioch by the Emperor Theodosius of blessed memory, who wrote thither. Letters were likewise brought from the most blessed Pope, the most holy Bishop of Rome, that this man should not be a bishop: and the letters are evident." This is certainly a strong proof that the Holy Roman See exercised control over the decisions of patriarchs in their own jurisdictions, without demur on their parts. The sentence of the Pope was definitive, and again annulled the decision and confirmation of the patriarch.

Lucianus, Bishop of Byziæ, and some other bishops, interposed in favour of Bassianus, urging once more than his nomination had been validated by the *confirmation* of Proclus. (*βεβαιῶσαι τὴν τοῦτου ἐπισκοπὴν*). The answer of Stephanus was short and pithy:—"The most holy Archbishop Leo of Rome deposed him because he was made contrary to the canons."\*

What was the result? That Bassianus was declared an intruder, and possessed of no right to the see of Ephesus. But was Stephanus on that account considered his lawful substitute, and allowed to retain the metropolitan chair? By no means. To have proved the person deposed a usurper, did not by any means justify his nomination, or heal any irregularities in it. Upon the motion, therefore, of the papal legates, it was decided, that neither of these should keep possession of the see; but that a new election should be proceeded to, and a pension allowed from the revenues of the bishopric for the maintenance of the two deposed bishops, who should keep the title and communion of bishops.† In like manner, therefore, even if the Catholic bishops nominated under Mary could be proved intruders, no argument would result in favour of the Elizabethan creation; as the link is absolutely wanting which could alone give them any claim upon succession to those who, before such imaginary intrusion, held our metropolitan and episcopal sees.

---

\* Ibid. col. 698.

† Ibid. col. 700.

## TRACT N<sup>o</sup>. 5.

OCCASIONED BY THE PUBLICATION OF THE "TRACTS FOR THE TIMES," &c.

---

I MUST refer the reader back to the last Tract for the commencement of the subject I am about to continue. In that tract I examined, by the light of antiquity, the claims advanced by the Oxford Divines in favour of apostolical succession in their Church. In order to simplify the controversy, I made concessions till I almost feared I might have scandalized my brethren. I wished to take up the controversy upon the lowest imaginable grounds, and for this purpose I made the following liberal allowances.

First, I put aside all question respecting the validity or invalidity, of ordination and consecration in the Anglican Church.

Secondly, I entirely considered the case of this Church as one to be investigated by canonical enactments, overlooking the great point of ecclesiastical and doctrinal union with the universal Church, which is essential, *jure divino*, for the legitimate existence and exercise of hierarchical authority.

Thirdly, I limited the rights of the holy see, to be a party to the lawful appointment of bishops in England, to those of the patriarchate, instead of considering those of its supremacy.

Fourthly, I even imagined the hypothesis, that the rights exercised by the pope, as patriarch of England, had no better foundation than usurpation at the outset.

After making all these abatements in our just assumptions, I proved that the advocates of the Anglican Church could not sustain any claim on her part to a share in apostolical succession. But it was not by any means my intention to leave the investigation there. On the contrary, I promised to raise the question to a higher level, and discuss our adversaries' pretensions, or rather repel them, upon considerations involving more serious consequences. The following extract from the last tract will at once explain my actual position, and define the point from which the present starts:—

"After this clear exposition of my motives, I shall not, of course, be suspected of having yielded too much, or placed the rights of the Holy See upon too low a ground. I have certainly given up much. I have discussed the matter as one of ecclesiastical right, rather than of divine; and have shown, that, even thus, the jurisdiction and succession claimed by the Tracts for their Church, is null. But, in fact, it would be in my power to show, that such rights as the Apostolic See held, and yet does hold, over the episcopacy of the Church, are not of ecclesiastical origin, but belong essentially to the Chair of Peter, as granted to it by our Lord himself. This leads me to another and a much higher ground, on which to base any resistance to the pretensions of the English Church and its upholders to be an apostolical establishment, or 'a branch,' as they choose to call it, 'of the Catholic Church,'—a ground, too, which still dispenses with all enquiry into the validity of Anglican ordination. I mean THE STATE OF SCHISM into which it put itself at the Re-

formation, and which at once acted as a blight upon all its ecclesiastical powers,—withering them, and rendering them incapable of any act of valid jurisdiction, or any place in the apostolical succession. This portion of my argument, with many other matters connected with this subject, I reserve for the next number. I shall treat it by the light of ecclesiastical antiquity, and exhibit instances curiously parallel with that of the Anglo-Hibernian establishment.”

I hardly consider it necessary, for the adversaries whom I am combating, to prove that a Church, placed in a state of schism, at once forfeits all right to the lawful exercise of its hierarchical functions. All the examples quoted in the last tract, and the abundant testimonies which I shall give in this, will sufficiently prove that, according to the principles of the ancient Church, a state of schism is a state of sin, of outlawry, and deprivation; and that, even where ecclesiastical functions might be *validly* exercised, they cannot be so, either lawfully or salutarily. The bishops of a schismatical Church could not be admitted to vote or deliberate at a general council, nor be present, save as an accused or an accusing party; they could not be allowed to communicate with other bishops, without first retracting their schismatical principles; and upon returning to the unity of the Church, they would require to be formally reinstated into their sees, or would be removed to others, or remain suspended. In fine, it is only in the true Church of God that apostolical succession can be had; and any one, who, even maintaining the integrity of faith, held not to unity of communion, was anciently reckoned to be out of that Church. “*Nobiscum estis*,” writes St. Augustine, “in baptismo, in symbolo, in cæteris Dominicis sacramentis: in spiritu autem unitatis, et in vinculo pacis, in ipsa denique Catholica Ecclesia nobiscum non estis.” “You are with us in baptism, in the creed, in the other sacraments of the Lord; but in the spirit of unity, in the bond of peace,—in fine, in the Catholic Church itself—you are not with us.”—*Ad Vincent. Rogat. Ep. xciii. ol. xlviii.*

The paragraph I have extracted from the last tract pledges me to the painful duty of proving that the Anglican Church is fundamentally and essentially a schismatical Church, and as such, has no right to a place in the apostolical succession. Now, though I thus advance to a closer position with my adversaries, than in my last argument, yet I am aware that I am by no means going to the extent to which I have a right. Is the English Church *only* schismatical? Is it not as truly heretical; I unhesitatingly reply, Yes. The one state cannot easily exist without the other. St. Jerome clearly distinguishes the two, but at the same time draws this conclusion, of how naturally one runs into the other. “*Inter hæresim et schisma*,” he observes, “*hoc esse arbitrantur, quod hæresim perversum dogma habet; schisma, propter episcopalem discessionem, ab ecclesia separatur. Cæterum nullum schisma non sibi aliquam confingit hæresim, ut recte ab ecclesia recessisse videatur.*” “This they suppose to distinguish heresy from schism,—that erroneous doctrine constitutes heresy, while schism is a separation from the Church by the secession of bishops. However, no schism fails to frame some heresy to justify its departure from the Church.” In *Epist. ad Tit. c. iii.* And so, likewise, St. Augustine:—“*Schisma [est] recens congregationis ex aliqua senten-*



tiarum diversitate dissensio ; hæresis autem schisma inveteratum." That is to say, seldom will schism fail to justify its separation from the Church by departing from its doctrine, and so insisting that the supposed errors, which it abandoned, obliged it to separation. In this way does the Anglican Church plead doctrinal necessities for its schism,—and that very plea proves heresy. But in my argument on the subject of apostolical succession I am willing to consider the separation as simply schismatical, in the same manner as we speak of the Greek Church, which is, in truth, heretical. The fact is, that I can fully attain my purpose with the more lenient charge for my basis, and therefore prefer it. The case of heresy in the Church of England, can, indeed, be summarily made out on the simple ground of its having rejected the decrees of an œcumenical council. Still it might be considered necessary to go into details of doctrines, to establish the point to full satisfaction. At the same time the Fathers make no distinction between heresy and schism, as a ground of forfeiture of the rights belonging to the true Church, of which jurisdiction is one. Once more let us hear the great Doctor of the Western Church :—"Credimus et sanctam ecclesiam, utique Catholicam. Nam et hæretici et schismatici congregationes suas ecclesias vocant : sed hæretici de Deo falsa pronunciando, ipsam fidem violant ; schismatici autem dissensionibus iniquis a fraterna charitate dissiliunt, quamvis ea credant quæ credimus. Quapropter nec hæretici pertinent ad Ecclesiam Catholicam quæ diligit Deum ; nec schismatici, quoniam diligit proximum." "We believe the holy, yea, the Catholic Church. For heretics likewise and schismatics call their congregations Churches ; but heretics, by speaking falsely of God, violate faith ; and schismatics, by wicked dissensions, depart from fraternal charity, although they believe what we believe. Wherefore neither heretics belong to the Catholic Church, which loves God, nor schismatics, because she loves her neighbour." *De Fide et Symb. c. x. tom. vi. p. 161.*

From the passages I have already given, it must sufficiently appear what is the distinction between the two states, the one supposing error in faith, the other separation from unity. Now, in investigating the position of the Anglican Church, in regard to the latter, I wish strictly to adhere to the method I employed in the former tract, to examine it by the light of antiquity, and judge it entirely by the rules laid down and determined by the fathers of the primitive Church. Such, in fact, is the standard by which these divines desire to be measured ; and it is a satisfaction to me, to have this point, at least, of complete agreement. I shall, therefore, take a case from the history of the early Church, which I consider parallel, even to an extraordinary degree, with that of the English established Church ; from it we shall learn what were the criterions by which the fathers of the ancient Church judged of a case of schism, and what the manner in which they expressed their sentiments concerning it. We shall, moreover, hear the objections brought by the schismatics, and the answers given to them.

No schism longer, or more extensively, afflicted the Church, or gave rise to more interesting discussions, than that of the Donatists in Africa ; and I therefore select it, as an illustration of the controversy between us and the Anglicans.

The Donatists, although they received their name from Donatus, schismatical bishop of Carthage, yet dated from the intrusion of his predecessor, Majorinus, consecrated by several bishops, while Cæcilianus held the see; on the ground that the latter was disqualified from holding it, because his consecrators had delivered up the sacred volumes to the persecutors. These bishops, seventy in number, assembled in council at Carthage, with Secundus of Tigisi, primate of Numidia, at their head, wrote to the Churches of all Africa a synodal letter, in which they declared the consecration of Cæcilianus to be schismatical, and refused to communicate with him.\* Here then we have a strong case, in the supposition that each national Church has an independent existence. A large body of bishops, headed by the neighbouring primate, steps in to examine an election, charged with grievous irregularities, and pronounces a sentence, which is communicated to all the rest of the African Church. They consider Cæcilianus as an intruder, and appoint Majorinus in his place. A large portion of the African Church assent to their sentence, and from henceforth consider the latter as the legitimate archbishop, and refuse to hold communion with the former. On the other hand, many continue to consider Cæcilianus as true bishop of Carthage, and remain united with him in communion.

But, before examining how this complicated state of things was resolved, I must not omit to say a few words concerning the unhappy passions that led to this schism; the reader, I think, will be as struck as I have always been, with their exact resemblance to those that produced the separation of England from the communion of the Church. St. Optatus sums them up in these words: "*Schisma igitur illo tempore confusæ mulieris iracundia peperit, ambitus nutrit, avaritia roboravit.*" "The schism, therefore, was at that time bred by the rage of a disgraced woman, was nourished by ambition, and strengthened by covetousness." *De Schism. Donatist. lib. i. cap. xix. ed. Dupin, p. 18.* The first of these causes was the anger of a powerful woman, called Lucilla, who could not brook the discipline and reproofs of the true Church.† She thought it, therefore, advisable to excite a schism, and with money and influence encouraged those bishops who were already inclined to cause one. Who does not here see a remarkable coincidence with the case of Anne Boleyn and her fautors,‡ who seeing that the discipline of the Church would not admit of her impious designs, brought about, as the first cause, the king's awful separation? "*irascienti et dolenti,*" as St. Optatus writes, "*ne disciplinæ succumberet.*" The second cause of the schism was ambition; in Africa, that of some who sought to obtain the episcopal dignity; in England, that of Henry, who desired to possess the supremacy of the national Church. The third was covetousness, in both cases, after the wealth of the Church. A considerable quantity of Church

\* S. Aug. in *Brevicul. Collationis*, cap. xiv. *Oper. tom. ix. p. 569. Auct. lib. cont. Fulgentium Donatist. cap. xxvi. Ibid. Append. p. 12.*

† *Ib. c. xvi.* She had been reprehended by Cæcilianus for superstitious devotion to unauthenticated relics.

‡ "*Cum omnibus suis potens et factiosa femina, communioni misceri noluit.*" *Ib. c. xviii.*

plate and ornaments had been deposited in the hands of some leading men among the clergy and people, by the Deacon Felix, from fear of persecution. These they appropriated to themselves, and when called on by Cæcilianus to restore what was not theirs, preferred to become schismatics, so to retain possession of their ill-gotten wealth. A very similar desire to enrich themselves by the plunder of the Church, and appropriation of the accumulated wealth of ages, will easily be recognized as the chief corroborator, in powerful men among the laity and clergy, of their wish to depart from the unity of faith.

The foundations of the schism thus laid, it became every day more and more complicated in its operation. For the number of bishops who maintained it was very considerable, and spread over the whole of Christian Africa, to such an extent, that many dioceses were entirely in their hands, and the Catholics in some districts exceedingly few in number. The Donatists became so powerful, as to take forcible possession of churches; and seize upon the property and persons of the Catholics. Hence the civil power found it necessary to interfere, and send deputies into Africa, to repress the extravagances, and chastise the excesses, of these desperate men. This only led to their having a new boast, that of confessors and martyrs, titles which they readily gave to all that suffered for crimes connected with the schism.\* Many of the questions of fact, as we learn from St. Augustine, became, in course of time, involved in obscurity: such as the true case of Cæcilianus's consecration, and his real character; so that, in truth, it had become difficult for a simple individual to unravel the matter, or decide for himself to which party he ought to belong. The Catholic pastors, therefore, exerted themselves by every means in their power, to point out such simple arguments as would at once convince the most illiterate with whom they ought to side. These I shall proceed to present to my readers.

In the first place, they generally treat with the Donatists as with schismatics, and not heretics. It is a question whether these men insisted upon the erroneous doctrine generally attributed to them, of having rebaptized those who had been baptized by heretics, whether such truly, or only in their judgment. St. Augustine quotes Tichonius, of whom I shall later speak, as assuring us that, in 330, a council of two hundred and seventy Donatist bishops condemned the practice; and as appealing to witnesses still living in 380.† The same father acquits them of any error respecting the Trinity, although Donatus himself is supposed by him to have had some erroneous opinions concerning it. St. Optatus clearly acquits them of errors in faith, thus writing to Parmenianus: "*Bene clausisti hortum hæreticis, bene revocasti claves ad Petrum, &c. . . . Vobis verò schismaticis, quamvis in catholica non sitis, hæc negari non possunt, quia nobiscum vera et communia sacramenta traxistis. Quare cum hæc omnia hæreticis bene negentur, quid tibi visum est, hæc*

---

\* See, for instance, the acts of Marculus, written with all the pathos of those of the true martyrs, and those of Maximian and Isaac, first published by Mabillon, and republished in St. Optatus's Works, p. 193, seq. Macrobius was the Fox of the Donatists.

† Ep. xxxix.

et vobis negare voluisse, quos schismaticos esse manifestum est? vos enim foras existis." "Rightly hast thou closed up the garden to heretics, rightly hast thou claimed the keys for Peter . . . But to you schismatics, although you are not in the Catholic Church, these things cannot be denied, because you have taken the true sacraments in common with us. Wherefore, since these are all rightly denied to heretics, why have you thought that there is any wish to deny them to you who are schismatics? For you have gone out." Lib. i. c. xii. p. 12. Hence, this saint always calls Parmenianus by the title of brother; and when this was indignantly rejected, vindicates it at length in the opening of his fourth book. Once more he repeats, that the Donatists are brethren, because they possess the same sacraments.\*

2ndly. The Donatists, as well as their adversaries, claimed the title of the Catholic Church. The general body of them (for we shall see that an important modification of their principles on this head was later introduced among them) maintained that the Catholic, that is, the true Church, only existed among themselves, and cut off from its pale all who were not in communion with them.† At the celebrated Conference of Carthage, held by order of Honorius, in 411, between the Catholic and Donatist bishops, (the former headed by St. Augustine, the latter by Petilianus,) the schismatics were exceedingly indignant that the title of *Catholic* should be exclusively claimed by, and given to, the other side. On the third day of the conference, when the moderator Marcellinus, called the orthodox by this name, Petilianus rose and said, "only that side is the Catholic, which shall carry off the victory in this contest."‡ But, throughout the conference, the Catholics strove in vain to bring their opponents to the point, as to who had a right to be considered the true Church; and it may be worth while to extract a few passages from the Acts, to show how similar the mode of argument pursued on both sides is to what would be pursued in a modern debate between Catholics and Protestants.

"Fortunatianus, bishop of the Catholic Church, said, 'Explain the grounds of your separation and dissension from the universal Church, spread over the entire world.'" After some tergiversation, being once more pressed by Fortunatianus, "Petilianus, bishop, said; 'That the Catholic Church is with me, our pure observance of the law, and your vices and crimes establish.'" He then goes off to other matters irrelevant to this question. Later, when Marcellinus once more gives the title of Catholic to the anti-Donatist side, Petilianus again demands that the Acts should give his party the same title. Marcellinus replies, that he gives that name to one party, because the imperial decree bestows it; and then Petilianus answers, that till the present contest is decided, it will be to them but an empty name. "He shall obtain it," he adds,

---

\* Cap. ii. p. 72. However, St. Augustine occasionally calls them heretics, as Cont. lit. Petil. lib. i. c. 1, where he says, "Donatistarum hæreticorum." He again argues the point more fully Cont. Crescon. Gram. lib. ii. cap. 4.

† "Eam (ecclesiam) tu frater Parmeniane, apud vos solos esse dixistis." S. Opt. lib. ii. cap. i. p. 28.

‡ Gesta Collat. Carthag. diei 3, cxlvi. ad Calc. Oper. S, Opt. p. 305.

"who, at its conclusion, shall be found truly a Christian."\* Emeritus, another Donatist bishop, spoke in the same strain. St. Augustine had urged the necessity of being in communion with the Church, which the Scriptures proclaim must be diffused over the entire world, "whose communion," he adds, "we appear to hold, but which is falsely charged by you with grievous crimes." To this, Emeritus replied, that whoever is truly a Christian, he only is Catholic, and can claim the name, and, that though it is by a sort of prescription borne on the forehead by the other party, yet it should be placed between the two as the reward of the victors.† This speech of Emeritus contains another plea, presenting a curious resemblance to the reasoning of the "Tracts," to which I may later allude.

3rdly. In addition to this desire to claim an equal right with their opponents to the name of Catholic, I must notice the desire on the part of the Donatists to disclaim this name,‡ or to fasten a similar one on the Catholics, just as that of "Romanist," or "Papist," is in vain applied to us by Protestants. Thus Petilianus, in the same conference, said: "Donatistas nos appellandos esse credunt, cum si nominum paternorum ratio vertitur, et ego eos dicere possum, immo palam aperteque designo Mensuristas et Cæcilianistas esse." "They think that we ought to be called Donatists; whereas, if account has to be taken of the parental names, I could call them, yea, I do openly and publicly call them, *Mensurians* and *Cæcilianists*." *Ibid.* p. 296.

Let us now see how the fathers argued on the other side, and what broad, clear and simple arguments they chose, to convict the Donatists of the crime of schism; to prove to them, that they belonged not to the Church of Christ, that is, to the Catholic Church, but must be content to bear the title which at once designated them as separatists, and followers of men, and not of God.

I. The first, the most frequently, and the most earnestly urged of these arguments, is the fact of the Donatist Church, however numerous its bishops and its people, being excluded from communion by other Churches, and not being admitted by them within the pale of the true Church. And this, as we shall see, is not an argument based upon right, but upon fact:—it does not require, in the opinion of the fathers, any previous examination into which party was right; the very fact of one's being in communion with foreign Churches, and the other's not, was considered a decisive proof that the former was necessarily in a state of schism. They lay down as principles, that the true Church of Christ was to be dispersed over the entire world, and that consequently, no national Church could claim for itself the distinction of being this only true Church. Thus reasons St. Optatus: "Ergo Ecclesia una est . . .

---

\* *Ibid.* p. 299. .

† "Quicumque justis legitimisque ex causis Christianus fuerit approbatus, ille meus est Catholicus, illi hoc nomen imponitur, ille debet sibi hanc regulam vindicare; quamvis ipsa Catholica, quæ nunc pro præscriptione partis adversæ quasi in fronte quadam rite adversum nos temperari cognoscitur, medium esse debet; et in judicio ita constitui, ut hoc nomen victor accipiat." *Ibid.* p. 301.

‡ The Tracts disallow the title of Protestant as applied to the Anglican Church. Vol. iii. p. 32. See also, Mr. Newman's "Letter to Dr. Faussett." 2nd edit.

Hæc apud omnes hæreticos et schismaticos esse non potest. Restat ut uno loco sit. Eam tu, frater Parmeniane, apud vos solos esse dixisti . . . Ergo ut in particula Africæ, in angulo parvæ regionis, apud vos esse possit; apud nos in alia parte Africæ non erit? In Hispaniis, in Gallia, in Italia, ubi vos non estis, non erit?" "Therefore, the Church is one . . . It cannot be with all heretics and schismatics. It must therefore be only in one place. Thou, brother Parmenianus, hast said, that it is with you alone. Therefore, as it may be with you in a small portion of Africa, in a little corner of the land, with us, in another part of Africa, it is not? In Spain, in Gaul, in Italy, where you are not, it is not?" Lib. ii. cap. 1, p. 28. He then enumerates other countries in which the Church existed, that held not communion with the Donatists: and reasons upon the texts of Scripture, which promise the entire earth to Christ as His kingdom. Now, the reasoning here is twofold, and in two ways applicable to modern controversy. In the first place, it attacks the foolish presumption of those, who would maintain that the Anglican Church is the only apostolic one, the only true Church of God, in consequence of the corruption of every other in communion with the Holy See. This is a common boast, of which it can hardly be necessary to bring examples to any reader versed in controversy. The argument of Optatus, grounded upon Scripture testimony, denies at once the possibility of any national Church being exclusively the true one, and those over the world that are in communion, being false. Secondly, this reasoning strikes as much at the theory of the Tracts, and other High-Church writings, which would fain have us consider the Church of Christ as an aggregate of many Churches, holding, indeed, different opinions and practices, and not actively communicating together, so that, the Anglican Church may be called "that branch of Christ's Church which is established amongst us," and the Church of Rome is allowed to be a portion (though a corrupt one) of the same Church of Christ. This system is directly at variance with the arguments of St. Optatus: "Restat ut uno loco sit." He does not imagine the possibility of Donatists being considered a part of the true Church: if *they* constitute it, the rest of the world is excluded—if Spain, Gaul and Italy, which are in mutual communion, Donatist Africa is shut out from the pale.

St. Augustine's reasoning on this subject is precisely the same. I think it needless to quote passages from him, where he maintains the universality of the Church, and, that that only can be the true Church, which is dispersed over the whole earth: because it would be difficult to read many pages of his writings against the Donatists, without meeting a commentary on one of these or similar passages: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." "I will give thee the nations for thine inheritance," &c. "He shall rule from sea to sea, and from the river to the bounds of the earth."

Upon these texts he insists against Parmenianus, against Petilianus, and against Cresconius, as sufficient to prove that the Churches in communion must be true, to the exclusion of all that stand in separation from them. However, the texts which I shall have occasion to quote, will put the sentiments of this most learned Doctor beyond all question. In fact, we must now see the pleas whereby the Donatists justified their

state of separation from communion with the rest of the world; and we shall see how exactly they resemble those of Protestants, and how they were met by this great Father.

1. First, they argued that the corruptions of the Church were such as rendered it impossible for them to keep in communion with it. This was the common plea of all schismatics. St. Jerome tells us, that a Luciferian, disputing with a Catholic, "asserted that the entire world belonged to the devil, and, as it is their wont to say, that the Church was become a house of wickedness."\* *Parmenianus* in like manner affirmed, "that the Gauls, the Spaniards, and the Italians, and their friends, by whom he must understand the entire world, 'resembled the African *Traditors* by participation in their crimes and companionship in their guilt.'"+ "Hence," he concluded, "that the whole world had been contaminated by the crime of surrendering the sacred books, and other sacrileges."‡ This language resembles not a little that of the book of *Homilies*, regarding the corruptions of the Church before the Reformation. But the resemblance between the ancient and modern schism is, on this point, still stronger. The *Donatists* went on to say that there came, at that time, godly men, who bore witness against the prevarications of the Church, and urged those certain provinces to purge out the foul abuses that had crept in, and separate themselves from those among them that adhered to them, and consequently from those foreign Churches who kept communion with these. "Dicit enim legatione functos quosdam, sicut ipse asserit, fidelissimos testes ad easdem venisse provincias, deinde geminato adventu sanctissimorum, sicut ipse dicit, Domini sacerdotum, dilucide, plenius ac verius publicata esse quæ obijciunt." "He says that most faithful witnesses, as he calls them, acted as ambassadors to those provinces; then by the repeated arrival of most holy priests of the Lord, as he says, these things which they object were clearly, more fully and truly published." *Ibid.* cap. ii. "Frustra dicit *Parmenianus* 'damnatos in Africa traditores in consortium damnationis acceptos a provinciis transmarinis.'" "In vain does *Parmenianus* say, that the traitors condemned in Africa, were received into fellowship of condemnation by the provinces beyond the seas." *Ibid.* cap. iv. Now, the answer which the Fathers make to this excuse for separation, is such exactly as we make, and is perfectly applicable to the case between us and the Anglican Church. They put against it at once the promises of Scripture, that the universality of God's Church should never fail, and made it a question between the authority of God and of men, whether those promises could fail, or not rather the testimony of men be false. "*Homo putans sibi magis credi debere quam Deo*," St. Augustine calls the man who makes that argument. "Quid quæso te," he asks, "quid per ipsos fideles

\* "Asserebat quippe (*Luciferianus*) universum mundum esse diaboli, et, ut jam familiare est ipsis dicere, factum de Ecclesia lupanar." *Dialog. adv. Lucifer.* cap. 1, tom. ii. p. 173, ed. Vallars.

+ "Gallos, et Hispanos, et Italos, et eorum socios (quos ubique totum orbem vult intelligi) traditoribus Africanis commercio scelerum, et societate criminum dicit esse consimilem." *August. cont. Epist. Parmen. lib. i. cap. ii.*

‡ "Dicit *Parmenianus* hinc probari consceleratum fuisse orbem terrarum criminibus traditionis, et aliorum sacrilegiorum." *Ibid.* cap. iii.

testes quos vultis Deo esse fideiores, quid publicatum est? An quia per Africos traditores, semen Abrahamæ quod est Christus, non est permissum venire usque ad omnes gentes, et ibi exaruit quo pervenit? Dicite jam magis collegis vestris credendum esse quam testamento Dei." "A man who thinks he ought to be believed rather than God." . . . "What, I ask you, what was published by these faithful witnesses, whom you make more worthy of credit than God himself? That, through the African traditors, the seed of Abraham, which is Christ, was not permitted to come to all nations, and was dried up where it had reached? Say at once, that we must believe your colleagues more than God's Testament." *Ib.* cap. ii. I would willingly extract the entire paragraph, which is most apposite and conclusive for our case. St. Jerome makes use of a similar argument from the Scripture promises. "If Christ has not a Church, or has it only in Sardinia, he has become too poor; and if Satan possess Britain, the Gauls, the people of India and barbarous nations, and the entire world, how have the trophies of the Cross been bestowed upon one corner of the whole earth?"\*

But the reasoning of the Fathers is sometimes closer and more to my purpose even than this. They propose to the Donatists the same dilemma as we, in our controversy, do to Protestants. Either the Church was so corrupted before your Reformers came, that it had ceased to be the Church of God, or not. If it was, then had Christ's promises failed, which secured perpetuity to his Church; if not, whence did those who separated from it derive their authority for this purpose, or how could any act or teaching of theirs make it cease to be what it was before? The following passage of St. Augustine is to this effect: "Quod si erat etiam tunc Ecclesia, et hæreditas Christi non, interrupta, perierat, sed per omnes gentes augmenta accipiens permanebat, tutissima ratio est in eadem consuetudine permanere quæ tunc bonos et malos in una complexione portabat. Si autem tunc non erat Ecclesia, quia sacrilegi hæretici sine baptismo recipiebantur, et hoc universali consuetudine tenebatur; unde Donatus apparuit? de qua terra germinavit? de quo mari emerisit? de quo cælo cecidit? Nos itaque, ut dicere cœperam, in ejus Ecclesiæ communione securi sumus, per cujus universitatem id nunc agitur quod est ante Agrippinum, et inter Agrippinum et Cyprianum per ejus universitatem similiter agebatur." "But, if the Church then was, and Christ's inheritance had not perished, by being interrupted, but, receiving increase through all nations, yet endured, it is the safest principle to persevere in the same practice which then united in one embrace the good and the evil. But, if at that time, there was no Church, because sacrilegious heretics were received without (repetition of) baptism, and this was the universal practice, whence did Donatus make his appearance? from what earth did he spring up? from what sea did he emerge? from what heavens did he fall? We, therefore, as I had begun to say, are secure in the communion of that Church, through the entire of which that is now

---

\* "Si ecclesiam non habet Christus, aut in Sardinia tantum habet, nimium pauper factus est. Et si Britannias, Gallias, Indorum populos, barbaras nationes, et totum semel (*simul*) mundum possideat Satanas, quomodo ad angulum universæ terræ Crucis trophæa collata sunt?" Ubi sup. No. 15, p. 186.



practised, which, in like manner, was practised through it entire, before Agrippinus and between Agrippinus and Cyprian." *De Baptismo cont. Donatistas. Lib. iii. cap. 2.* Here then it is taken for granted, that the very fact of any practice being followed or tolerated in the Church is a sufficient vindication of it; and that, whenever a separation takes place from the body of the Church on the ground of such being corruptions, those are safe who adhere to the portion that perseveres in those practices, while the pretended reformers are at once to be rejected, as having no mission or commission for their schismatical undertakings. The same Father uses the same argument on other occasions. For instance, in his treatise "*De unico Baptismo*," where he writes as follows:—"If that be true which these men assert, and by which they endeavour to maintain or excuse the cause of their separation, namely, that the fellowship of the wicked in the same sacrament defiles the good, and that therefore, we must separate ourselves bodily from the contagion of the evil, lest all should together perish;\* it clearly follows, that at the time of Stephen and Cyprian, the Church had perished, nor was any left to posterity, in which Donatus himself could be spiritually born. But if they consider it impious to say this, for in truth, it is impious, then, as the Church remained from these times to the times of Cæcilianus and Majorinus, or of Donatus, . . . so could the Church remain after this latter period, which, encreasing through the entire world, as had been foretold of her, the particular crimes of any traditors or other wicked men could not defile . . . There was no reason, therefore, but it was an act of the greatest madness, for these men, as if to avoid the communion of the wicked, to have separated themselves from the unity of Christ, diffused over the entire world."†

These passages hardly require any comment; any reader of ordinary judgment, will see how St. Augustine must, upon his principles, have judged the case of the English Church, if it put in the plea of justification, which the great body of its defenders do, that the absolute corruptions of the foreign Churches with which it had before been in communion, as well as of those at home, who resolved upon keeping up that communion, made it imperative on her to refuse communion without their reformation. For he takes it for granted; first, that before such a call on them was made, these aggregated Churches constituted the true unfaill-

---

\* How often do we see and hear applied to those in communion with the Catholic Church, those words, "Go out from her, my people, that you be not partakers of her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues." Rev. xviii. 4.

† "Si ergo verum est quod isti dicunt, et unde causam suæ separationis asserere vel excusare conantur, in una communione sacramentorum mali maculant bonos, et ideo corporali disjunctione a malorum contagione recedendum est ne omnes pariter pereant; jam tunc Stephani et Cypriani temporibus constat periisse Ecclesiam, nec posteris derelictam, ubi Donatus spiritualiter nasceretur. Quod si dicere nefarium judicant, quia revera nefarium est, sicut mansit Ecclesia ex illis temporibus usque ad tempora Cæcilianii et Majorini, sive Donati, . . . sic potuit et deinceps Ecclesia permanere, quam toto, sicut de illa prædictum est, terrarum orbe crescentem nullo modo poterant quorumlibet traditorum ac facinorosorum aliena crimina maculare . . . Nulla igitur ratio fuit, sed maximus furor, quod isti velut malorum communionem caventes, se ab unitate Christi quæ toto orbe diffunditur separarunt." *De unic. Bapt. cont. Petil. c. xiv.*

ing Church of Christ; secondly, that if a particular Church, such as the African or the British, called upon them to make changes, or, by making such separated itself actually or virtually from their communion, they could not thereby lose their prerogative, but remained what they were before; thirdly, that it was safe to remain in communion with these rather than with the separating Church; fourthly, that if Cyprian, (still less, if Berengarius or Huss), with some, protested against a practice, held in his time by the great body of the Church,\* it could not thereby cease to be what it was before, nor could any portion of the Church plead in excuse of its separation any such decision, but such a portion at once became involved in the guilt of schism and all its entailed forfeitures. These principles, if applied to modern controversy, will go a great way towards deciding the respective positions of the Catholic and Anglican Churches.

2. But it may perhaps be said, that the case between us and Protestants is by no means so simple as that of the Donatists and the Catholics of their times, but that the decision as to a case of schism must depend upon the examination of the points of difference. Now to this I reply, that by the Fathers, who combated the Donatists, the question was essentially considered one of fact rather than of right; that is to say, the very circumstance of one particular Church being out of the aggregation of other Churches, constituted these judges over the other, and left no room for questioning the justice of the condemnation. St. Augustine has a golden sentence on this subject, which should be an axiom in theology: "Quapropter SECURUS judicat orbis terrarum, bonos non esse qui se dividunt ab orbe terrarum, in quacumque parte orbis terrarum." "Wherefore, the entire world judges WITH SECURITY, that they are not good, who separate themselves from the entire world, in whatever part of the entire world." Cont. Epist. Parmen. Lib. iii. cap. 3. This principle he repeats in fuller terms on another occasion: "Inconcussum igitur," he writes, "firmumque teneamus, nullos bonos ab ea (Dei Ecclesia) se posse dividere; id est nullos bonos etiamsi cognitos sibi malos patiantur, ubicumque versantur, propter se a longe positos et incognitis bonis temerario schismatis sacrilegio separare; et in quacumque parte terrarum vel facta sunt ista vel fiunt *vel futura sunt*, ceteris terrarum partibus longe positos, et utrum facta sint, vel cur facta sint ignorantibus, et tamen cum orbe terrarum in unitatis vinculo permanentibus, ea ipsa sit firma securitas non hoc potuisse facere, nisi aut superbiæ tumore furiosos, aut invidentiæ livore vesanos, aut sæculari commoditate corruptos, aut carnali timore perversos." "Let us, therefore, hold it for an unshaken and stable principle, that no good men can separate themselves from it (the Church): that is, that, although they may have to endure evil men, known to themselves, no good men, wherever they may be, can, on their own account, separate, by the rash sacrilege of schism, from the good, living far off and unknown to them. And, in whatever part of the world this has been done, or is done, *or shall be*, while the other distant parts of the

---

\* "Multi cum illo (Stephano) quidam cum isto (Cypriano) se utiebant." *Ibid.*

earth are ignorant that it has been done, or wherefore it has been done, and yet continue in the bond of union with the rest of the world ; let this be considered quite certain, that none can have so acted, unless they had been either furious with swelling pride, or insane with livid envy, or corrupted by worldly advantage, or perverted by carnal fear." *Ibid.* cap. v. Here then is a general rule applicable not merely to the Donatist case, but to all future possible divisions in the Church. Those cannot be possibly right who have separated themselves from the communion of distant Churches which remain still connected in the bond of unity. Whatever plea may be set up, of corruptions or abuses, the true ground of separation will be one of those pointed out by the great St. Augustine. And, in truth, who does not acknowledge that the "haughty fury" of Henry VIII, the "worldly advantage" of his, and his son's "corrupt" nobility, and the "carnal fear" and time-serving policy of a "perverted," heartless clergy, who had not the courage to follow More and Fisher to the scaffold, produced and promoted the first schismatical separation of England from the communion of the other Churches dispersed over the world ?

3. The principles thus far laid down, on the authority of the ancient Church, meet not only the reasoning of the ultra-Protestants, but also those of the High Church, or Oxford school. For they maintain, that, although throughout the middle ages, the Church in communion with Rome, was, in spite of her errors, the true Church, because she had not sanctioned them by any positive decree, yet she forfeited her title, and became heretical, when at the Council of Trent she did so.\* Now this was precisely the argument of the Donatists, which we have seen combated by St. Augustine. They allowed that, at the time of St. Cyprian, the Church in communion with Pope Stephen was true and orthodox, though the same evil principles and abuses existed which they so severely reprobated ; but no sooner did the body of foreign Churches formally adopt and approve these malpractices, and the erroneous maxims on which they were grounded, than they fell into a state of heresy and schism. Now we have seen St. Augustine put this case, and demonstrate that either the Church failed in the first instance, and so was lost, and with it lawful sacraments and orders ; or else that this could not be admitted in the second. We have seen how any one Church, in one portion of the world, could not possibly be allowed to be right, while protesting against the union of other Churches over the rest of the world. The very fact of its being in such a position, at once condemns it and proves it to be in schism. Still it may be both interesting and instructive to pursue this enquiry still farther, and see this particular plea more closely examined. For it so happened that the Donatists, like the

---

\* "True, Rome may be considered (heretical) now ; but she was not considered heretical in the first ages. If she has apostatized, it was at the time of the Council of Trent. . . Accordingly, acknowledging and deploring all the errors of the middle ages, yet we need not fear to maintain, that after all, they were but the errors of individuals, though of large numbers of Christians."—Tract xv. p. 10, where in a note the opinion of Gilpin is quoted, with approbation, that after that epoch "it seemed to him a matter of necessity to come out of the Church of Rome." This is perfectly the Donatist view of the case.

modern Anglicans, asserted that they were not the separatists, but that the other Churches were. These are their words:—"Si vos tenere Catholicam dicitis, Catholicos illud est quod Græce dicitur unum sive totum. Ecce in toto non estis, quia in partem cessistis." "If you say that you have the Catholic Church, καθολικός is, in Greek, 'one,' or 'whole.' Behold, you do not constitute the whole, since you have seceded apart."—Cont. Liter. Petil. lib. ii. cap. 38. To this St. Augustine, on this occasion, contents himself with first explaining the meaning of the term "Catholic," to wit, that which is extended over all the world, and then by throwing ridicule on the extravagance of the assertion. "How can we be separatists," he asks, "whose communion is diffused over the entire world? But, as if you were to say to me, that I am Petilianus, I should not know how to refute you, except by laughing at you as in jest, or pitying you as insane;—I see no other course now. But as I do not think you were joking, you see what alternative remains."\*

On another occasion, the same holy Father gives a decisive criterion whereby it may be determined who went forth from the Church, or who were, in other words, the violators of Catholic unity. It was not long before the Donatists split into innumerable sects; the usual consequence of departure from unity. But the account of this division is so well given by St. Augustine, and so accurately describes the vicissitudes of modern, as well as of ancient schism, that we must be allowed to quote his words:—"Eadem pars Donati in multa minutissima frusta conscissa est, quæ omnes minutissimæ particulæ hanc unam multo grand rem in qua Primianus est, de recepto Maxiministarum baptismo reprehendunt; et singulæ conantur asserere apud se tantummodo verum baptismum remansisse, nec omnino esse alibi, neque in toto orbe terrarum, qua Ecclesia Catholica expanditur, nec in ipsa grandiore parte Donati, nec in ceteris præter se unam ex minutissimis particulis." "The very sect of Donatus is divided into many very minute parts, every one of which minute parts blames this much larger one, in which Primianus is, for having received the baptism of the Maximinians; and each one endeavours to maintain that true baptism has remained in it alone, and is nowhere else, neither in the entire world, over which the Catholic Church is spread, nor in the larger sect itself of Donatus, nor in any other except itself, one of the said most minute parts." De Baptis. cont. Donatistas, lib. i. cap. ii. If for the "pars Donati" we substitute the Anglican Church, what a faithful picture we have of the minute subdivisions of separatism into which dissent from her has broken; every one of which denies to the others sound doctrine,—as the Donatists did baptism,—as well as to the original branch of which they are the boughs, and to the great trunk of Catholic and apostolical descent from which both it and they have been lopped off.

But to come to our point, which is, the criterion suggested by St.

---

\* "Sed quemadmodum, si mihi diceret quod ego sim Petilianus, non invenirem quomodo refellerem, nisi ut aut jocantem riderem, aut insanientem dolerem; hoc mihi nunc faciendum esse video; sed quia jocari te non video, vides quid restet."—*Ibid.*

Augustine for determining who are the separatists and schismatics. It is this:—You have no difficulty in deciding that these different sects separated from you, and not you from them (as they pretend); because, while *primitive* Donatism is commensurate with them all, each of these prevails more in one than in another province: the Rogatenses, for instance, in Cæsarean Mauritania; the Urbanenses in some parts of Numidia; and so forth. This criterion would apply to the Anglican Church. For some parishes are comparatively free from dissent; and there is no portion of England, however occupied by it, in which that Church is not found: then some sects, as the Quakers, are unknown in some districts, while they are abundant in others; different classes of Methodism, Unitarianism, or Moravianism, have their favourite districts, in which their teachers and followers more abound. And as the Anglican Church occupies all the space subdivided among them all, we justly conclude that they all went forth from it, and not it from them. In like manner, observes this learned Father, we see one heresy infest one country, and another another; each sect has its own territory,—for where it has sprung up, there, being of its nature unprolific, it lies till it withers up. But the Catholic Church occupies the whole world, taking in the very countries in which the respective sects exist, surrounding and compenetrating them; and, therefore, by parity of argument, this is proved to be the true Church, from which all they are separatists and schismatics.\* This argument is at once simple and conclusive. It supposes, what is of great importance in our controversy with the Oxford divines, the possibility,—nay, the necessity of the Church Catholic having members, in countries under a schismatical hierarchy, who communicate with the rest of the Catholic world; a point on which we shall have later to speak: “*Ipsa (Ecclesia) de qua præciduntur, etiam in eas terras extenditur ubi jacent illa quæque in sua regione fragmenta.*” Let us, then, apply the argument to our times. We see the Lutherans occupying the northern parts of the European continent, the Calvinists Switzerland, the Presbyterians Scotland, the Anglicans England. Not one of these has a Church, properly so called,† in any other country; none in Spain, or Italy, or France, or Southern Germany, or South America, or Syria, or China. “*Ubi cadunt ibi remanent.*” But we, that is, the

---

\* “*Contra universitatem vero Ecclesiæ, quia te inania repetere libuit, etiam hic tibi respondeo. Sicut in Africa pars Donati vos estis, a quibus apparet partem Maximiani schisma fecisse, quoniam non est per Africam, qua vos estis, vos autem et in regionibus in quibus illa est non deestis, nam et alia schismata facta sunt ex vobis, sicut Rogatenses in Mauritania Cæsariensi, Urbanenses in quadam Numidiæ particula, et alia nonnulla, sed ubi præcisa sunt ibi remanserunt. Et hinc enim apparet eos a vobis exiisse, non vos ab ipsis, quia vos etiam in his terris ubi ipsi sunt, illi autem quaqua versus vos estis non nisi forte peregrinantes inveniuntur. Sic Ecclesia Catholica, quæ sicut ait Cyprianus, ‘ramos suos per universam terram copia ubertatis extendit,’ ubique sustinet scandala eorum qui ab illa, vitio maximæ superbix præciduntur, aliorum hic, aliorum alibi atque alibi. . . . Ubi enim cadunt, ibi remanent, et ubi separantur ibi arescunt, unde ipsa de qua præciduntur etiam in eas terras extenditur, ubi jacent illa in sua quæque regione fragmenta:* in illa vero, singula, quacumque distenditur, non sunt, quamvis aliquando vix rarissima folia ex eorum ariditate ventus elationis in peregrina dispergat.”—Cont. Crescon. lib. iv. cap. 60.

† The small number of Protestants in France or Piedmont are not in communion with any other “fragment,” but form independent sects

Church wherewith we are in communion, extends over the whole of the world, occupying, extensively, several of these countries, and having large bodies of Christians in others. And even where those Protestant sects prevail, congregations and numerous flocks are found communicating with the one Church spread over the world. And what I have said of Protestant countries, I may extend, as St Augustine does, beyond the Donatists, to other heresies, as the Nestorians and Eutychians in the East. For almost wherever these are, Catholics exist; but they are not to be found, except as strangers, *nisi forte peregrinantes*, in countries entirely Catholic. We see, then, how simple and yet how efficacious is the test proposed by St. Augustine, for deciding whether the English Church be a seceder or not from Catholic unity.

At the same time I cannot forbear quoting another criterion proposed by the other Father, whom I have already copiously cited, St. Jerome. His words are strikingly applicable to our present case. I shall give them in the original: "Poteram diem istiusmodi eloquio ducere, et omnes propositionum rivulos uno Ecclesiæ sole siccare. Verum quia jam multum sermocinati sumus . . . . brevem tibi apertamque animi mei sententiam proferam, in illa esse Ecclesia permanendum, quæ ab Apostolis fundata usque ad diem hanc durat. Sic ubi audieris eos qui dicuntur Christi non a Domino Jesu Christo sed a quoquam alio nuncupari, ut puta Marcionitas, Valentinianos, Montenses, seu Campitas;\* scito non Ecclesiam Christi, sed Antichristi esse synagogam. Ex hoc enim ipso quod postea instituti sunt, eos se esse indicant quos futuros Apostolus prænuñciavit. Nec sibi blandiantur, si de Scripturarum capitulis videntur sibi affirmare quod dicunt, cum et diabolus de Scriptura aliqua sit locutus, et Scripturæ non in legendo consistent sed in intelligendo." "I could occupy the entire day with this subject, and dry up all the dribblets of (schismatical) propositions by the sun of the Church alone. But since our discourse has been long . . . I will briefly and clearly lay you down my opinion, that we must remain in that Church which, founded by the Apostles, endures unto this day. Wherever you hear those who are called Christians, receive their name not from the Lord Christ Jesus, but from some one else; as, for instance, the Marcionites, Valentinians, Montenses, or Campites, know that they are not the Church of Christ, but the synagogue of Antichrist. For, from the very fact of their being of later institution, they show themselves to be those whom the Apostle foretold. Neither let them flatter themselves, if they appear to prove what they say, by texts of Scripture; seeing that the devil cited passages from Scripture, and Scripture consists not in the reading, but in the understanding of it." Ubi supr. *in fine*. Now, though this criterion will, in most special wise, apply to those sects which bear the names of men, as Lutherans, Calvinists, and Wesleyans; yet will it be found applicable no less to any, whose designation indicates a state of separation from the rest of the Church. For the new Oxford school will not easily persuade men that their Anglican Church forms no part of the great *Protestant* defection, a title which at once expresses separation and opposition to that greater aggregation of Churches dispersed over the whole world, on

---

\* These were the names by which the Donatists of Rome were distinguished.

which no efforts have succeeded in fixing any different title beyond that of the *Catholic*.

4. But the Donatists endeavoured to escape from the application of this test by another sophistry. You, they said, are no more universal or Catholic than we. A great part of the world is still heathen,\* and much is occupied by sects which you do not admit into the pale of the Church. Or rather sometimes the Donatists affected to believe that Catholics readily admitted the latter into communion with them, in order to enlarge their grounds to claim that title.† To the first view St. Augustine replies, that heathen nations will gradually be converted, and that, to the end of the world, room will be left for the dilatation of religion, and the fulfilment of God's promises regarding the propagation of the faith. With regard to the other objection, he observes that we do not admit any who differ from us in faith into religious community; but that these, like the Donatists, are in different countries unprolific, and confined within certain limits, beyond which they have no power to spread, so as to put in a title to be considered the Church Catholic.‡ We see here two important points decided; first, how the Catholicity of our Church is not hemmed in by the many unconverted nations yet remaining, inasmuch as they are rather a field on which the Catholic prerogative of propagation and fecundity is to be exercised till the end of time; and, secondly, how the Catholic Church, then, as now, sternly excluded from its communion all sects that differed from it, instead of making the Catholic Church consist, as the tract writers would desire, of the heterogeneous amalgamation of various Churches differing in doctrine, as the Greeks, Syrians, and Anglicans, with the many harmoniously united in communion with Rome.§ On another occasion, we find St. Augustine answering the other form of the second of the rehearsed objections; namely, that the number of sects not in communion with those that call themselves the Catholic Church, excluded this from that title. "Quomodo," asked Cresconius, "totus orbis communione vestra plenus est, ubi tam multæ sunt hæreses, quarum vobis nulla communicat?"|| To this the saint replies, as on the other occasion, tacitly acknowledging the fact of non-communion with heretics, but still maintaining the universality of the Catholic Church.

---

\* "Omitto gentium barbararum proprias regiones, Persarum ritus, sidera Chædæorum, Ægyptiorum superstitiones." Crescon. ap. Aug. cont. eumd. Lib. iv. cap. 61.

† "Non ergo nobis communicant sicut tu dicis, Novatiani, Ariani, Patripassiani, Valentiniani," &c. *Ibid*.

‡ "1. Unde necesse est, non solum fecunditate nascentis Ecclesiæ, verum etiam permixta multitudine inimicorum ejus, per quos pietas ejus exerceri et probari posset, usque in finem judiciariæ separationis totus orbis impleatur . . . 2. Veruntamen ubicumque sunt isti (hæretici) illic Catholica, sicut in Africa, ita et vos: non autem ubicumque Catholica est, aut vos estis aut hæresis quælibet illarum. Unde apparet quæ sit arbor ramos suos per universam terram extendens, et qui sint rami fracti non habentes vitam radicis, atque in suis cuique jacentes et arescentes locis." *Ibid*.

§ See, for example, Tr. viii. p. 4, where the Churches of Rome, Holland, Scotland, Greece, and the acknowledgedly heretical churches of Asia, are enumerated as forming so many parts of the Church Catholic.

|| "How is all the world full of your communion, while there are so many heresies, not one of which communicates with you?" Cont. Cresc. lib. iii. cap. 65.

5. Only another subterfuge remains: it is, that to belong to the universal Church, it is not necessary to be in *active* intercourse and communion with the different parts that compose it; so that the Anglican Church may be a portion of Christ's Church Catholic, although it has no actual badges to show of amity and harmony with other portions of the same Church in Europe, or the East. Cresconius, the Donatist, made use of precisely this principle, which is necessary to the establishment of the system maintained on this subject by the Oxford divines: "Non communicat Oriens Africae, nec Africa Orienti." "The East does not communicate with Africa, nor does Africa with the East." *Ibid.* cap. 67. To this St. Augustine replies, that, "with the chaff, that is out of the Lord's barn-floor, the East does not indeed communicate, but with the Catholic wheat, and with the straw that is within, the East does communicate with Africa, and Africa with the East."\* The Donatists seem to have wished to maintain the independence of the African Church, as requiring no direct connexion with the Churches of Asia. Hence, on another occasion, where St. Augustine had a friendly conference with Fortunius, a Donatist bishop, the question, almost at its outset, turned upon this point. The learned Father asked him, which was the Church in which one must live well, "whether that which, according to the predictions of Holy Writ, was to be diffused over the entire world, or that which a small part of Africa, or the Africans, contained? At first, he tried to assert, that his communion was over the whole world. I asked him," he continues, "whether he could give letters of communion, which we called *formatæ*, whithersoever I wished; and I affirmed what was clear to all, that by this test, the entire question could be brought to a close."† But the Donatist soon ran off his ground, and turned to other matters. Now, if the courteous reader will take the trouble to turn to Tract No. 3 of this series, he will find the Anglicans challenged to the same proof of the assertion, which they make in common with the Donatists, that they are a part, or a branch of the Church Catholic, dispersed over the world. I took Barrow's criterions of religious unity, and showed how no prelate of the Anglican Church could safely attempt to apply them in practice to his Church.‡ If he sent letters of communion to any foreign bishop, (except perhaps in North America), they might be answered through courtesy, but the pledge of amity would not be accepted. I can challenge them, therefore, to the very same proof, as Augustine challenged Fortunius to, and the very fact of their not being able to

---

\* "Non sane sed in paleis hæreticis ab area Domini separatis: in frumentis autem catholicis et interioribus paleis omnino communicat Oriens Africae, et Africa Orienti." *Ibid.*

† "Deinde quærere cœpimus, quænam illa esset ecclesia ubi vivere sic oporteret, utrum illa quæ, sicut Sancta ante Scriptura prædixerat, se terrarum orbe diffunderet, an illa quam pars exigua vel Afrorum, vel Africae contineret. Ille primo asserere conatus est, ubique terrarum esse communionem suam. Quærebam utrum epistolas communicatorias quas formatas dicimus, posset quo vellem dare; et affirmabam, quod manifestum erat omnibus, hoc modo facillime illam terminari posse questionem." Epist. ad Eleus. Glor. et Fal. tom. ii. Ep. xlv. vol. clxiii. cap. 2.

‡ The criterions proposed by Dr. Barrow, are all *acts* of communion, not one of which would in practice be applicable to the English Church.



submit to it, would decide the question, as it did then, that they are in a state of schism. The twenty-third canon of the African code prescribes, that if any bishop travel beyond the sea, he provide himself with *literæ formatæ*, or letters of communion from his primate. This proves, that an active communion was required between Churches separated by the sea, so that any bishop bearing such letters, would be readily admitted into participation in all religious and ecclesiastical rites, with the bishops of the country in which he might travel. Would such letters from the English primate be heeded even in Europe? How much less in China, in India, or Syria? Yet, not only the letter of a Catholic primate, but that wherewith every bishop or vicar-apostolic usually furnishes any of his clergy, who have occasion to go abroad, is received with respect by every foreign bishop, and secures to its bearer all the rights of communion in belief and practice, and opens to him at once the gates of the sanctuary and the hearts of his fellow-labourers in Christ. St. Augustine is careful to remove the impression, that when he wrote to any Donatist leaders, he thereby entered into communion of faith: and thus proves to us the difference between civility and charitable intercourse, and communion in religion. “Unde factum est,” he writes, “ut etiam ad nonnullos Donatistarum primarios scriberemus, *non communicatorias literas, quas jam olim, propter suam perversitatem, ab unitate Catholica, quæ toto orbe diffusa est, non accipiunt*, sed tales privatas qualibus nobis uti etiam ad paganos licet.” “Whence it came, that we wrote to some of the chief men among the Donatists, not letters of communion, which they do not receive for a long time from the Catholic unity dispersed over all the world, on account of their perversity, but such private letters as it is lawful for us to send even to pagans.” Ep. xliii. ol. clxii. cap. 1.

If the case therefore of the Anglican Church had to be decided by the principles and the voice of antiquity, I do not see how any verdict, but that of schism, could be pronounced against it. It is in a state of separation from the aggregate of Churches dispersed over the world. It cannot make an excuse, it cannot raise a point either of fact or of right, in bar of judgment, which has not been already met by the judicious sagacity of the great supporter of the unity of the Church, when combating the cavils of the Donatists. But, I have yet a second and most important test provided for us by antiquity, whereby I must farther prove my point before I proceed to investigate the awful consequences in regard to apostolical succession and claims to authority, that result from this state of separation.

II. The second criterion of the true Church is closely allied to the first, though simpler in its application. According to the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, it is easy at once to ascertain who are the Church Catholic and who are in a state of schism, by simply discovering who are in communion with the See of Rome, and who are not. This test, as I just remarked, is nearly connected with the foregoing: inasmuch as, the Chair of Peter being the centre of the Catholic unity, all that communicated with it, knew at once that they were in communion with the rest of the Church dispersed over the world. To have kept up an active communication with all the sees, even with all the metropolitans of the

world, would have been, for each bishop, a difficult, not to say an impossible, undertaking. Nor could the faithful have easily discovered whether their own bishop preserved Catholic unity in this way. Let us then at once show the various ways in which this connexion with the apostolic see was applied to the preservation of unity and the immediate detection of schism.

1. We have seen that communion was actively kept up by means of the *epistolæ formatæ*. No doubt, on particular occasions, such as that mentioned by St. Augustine, any bishop writing to other sees, would have received in reply letters of communion. But ordinarily this regular interchange of religious communion all centred in the Apostolic See. I will not here inquire whether the *formatæ* which it sent even to patriarchs, were not of a much higher character, and contained a confirmation of their election, without which it was not admitted. I think decidedly, that such was the case.\* But, as I have throughout this discussion, desired and endeavoured to deal generously with our opponents, and have not insisted upon any point which I could waive in my argument, I am willing to act consistently in this matter too: and shall therefore suppose that the *formatæ* of the Holy See went no farther than to acknowledge religious communion with the bishops to whom they were addressed. Still, this intercourse was considered essential to the maintenance of religious unity, and its absence was a clear indication of a schismatical separation. We have a remarkable proof of this communication carried on by distant Churches through the medium of the Holy See, in an argument employed by St. Augustine. The Donatists, to prove that the rest of the Church had kept communion with them, asserted that the Council of Sardica had written a letter to Donatus of Carthage. To this the holy Father replies, that, supposing the synod to have been orthodox, it does not follow, that the Donatus mentioned was the bishop of Carthage, as the names of the sees are not cited in the letter. He then adds, “quod hinc maxime credibile est, quod ad Carthaginis episcopum, Romano prætermisso, nunquam orientalis Catholica scriberet.” “Which is the more credible, because the oriental Catholic Church never wrote to the Bishop of Carthage, passing over the Bishop of Rome.” Cont. Crescon. lib. iii. cap. 34. But St. Optatus is the writer who uses this argument in the clearest manner, and proves the schism of the Donatists by the simple fact of their not communicating with the rest of the world, through him who sat in the Chair of Peter. After tracing the succession of pastors from St. Peter to Siricius, he adds, “who is in fellowship with us, with whom the entire world is joined, in the society of one communion, through the intercourse of *formatæ*.”†

2. But this was by no means the highest ground on which commu-

---

\* Pope Boniface I. informs us, that Theodosius, fearing lest the election of Nestorius to the Constantinopolitan patriarchate would be null, “habere non existimans firmitatem,” because he (the pope), had not known of it, sent a deputation of courtiers and bishops, and “formatam huic a Sede Romana dirigi depoposcit, quæ ejus sacerdotium roboraret.” Ap. Constant. Epp. Rom. Pont. col. 1043.

† See the text quoted below.

nion with the see of Rome was required of all who wished to be considered within the pale of the Catholic Church. It was not for the convenience of mutual intercourse, but for the necessity of ecclesiastical unity, that the Chair of Peter and his successors had been made the centre, and received the headship, of the Church. St. Ambrose, writing to the Emperors, calls the Holy City, "*totius orbis Romani caput Romanam ecclesiam . . . inde enim in omnes venerandæ communionis jura dimanant.*" "The Roman Church head of the entire Roman Empire . . . for thence flow to all the rights of venerable communion." Ep. ii. ad Grat. et Valent. St. Optatus, however, lays the greatest stress upon this point. Again and again he presses the charge of schism upon the Donatists, because they are separated from the Chair of Peter. Having proved that the Catholic, or true, Church must be diffused over the entire world, he proceeds to point out more particular marks and ornaments whereby it may be more easily distinguished. The first of these is the *Cathedra* or episcopal chair. By this it is evident that he did not mean episcopacy in general, nor the succession of bishops validly ordained, as he allows the Donatists to have possessed these. He goes on therefore to explain his meaning and apply it. "We must see," he writes, "who sat first upon the chair, and where. If you are ignorant, learn; if you know it, blush; you cannot be charged with ignorance, therefore you must know it. . . . Therefore you cannot deny that you know, that in the city of Rome, the episcopal chair was bestowed on Peter first, on which sat Peter, the Head of all the apostles, whence he was called Cephas; in which ONE CHAIR unity was to be preserved by all, lest the rest of the apostles should stand up each one for a separate Church; so THAT HE SHOULD BE A SCHISMATIC AND A SINNER WHO SHOULD SET UP AGAINST THE ONE CHAIR, another.\*" Before proceeding to the next words of the Father, I will indulge in one or two remarks. It is repugnant to the obvious purport of his argument to imagine, with Chillingworth or Mr. Poole, that he here speaks only of schism *within* the Roman Church, strictly so called, by the setting up of a Donatist bishop in the city of Rome, in opposition to the one in direct succession from St. Peter. For St. Optatus speaks of the Roman see as *one* and *singular*, in reference not to any rival pretensions that might be set up with it, but in reference to the sees erected by the other apostles. Unity was to be preserved in this chair, in such way, as that no other *apostolic* chair was to be set up against it, without incurring the guilt of schism. What could be the motive for introducing here the mention of other apostolic sees, if the object was only to lay the basis for an argument

---

\* "Videndum est quis, et ubi prior cathedram sederet. Si ignoras, disce, si nosti, erubescas; ignorantia tibi adscribi non potest, restat ergo ut noveris. . . . Igitur negare non potes scire te in Urbe Roma, Petro primo Cathedram episcopalem esse collatam, in qua sederit omnium apostolorum caput Petrus, unde et Cephas appellatus est, in qua una cathedra unitas ab omnibus servaretur; ne ceteri apostoli singulas sibi quisque defenderent: ut jam schismaticus et peccator esset, qui contra singularem cathedram, alteram collocaret. "De schism. Donat. lib. ii. cap. 2, p. 31. The learned author to whom we allude in the next page, reads *tibi* for *sibi* in the last sentence." St. Cyprian Vindicated, p. 20. We follow Dupin's edition, which gives no various reading here. Of course the sense is precisely the same.

that he was a schismatic who erected a rival throne in the same see? A proposition so evident, that it certainly required no appeal to the respective positions of Peter and the other apostles. But St. Optatus well knew that there was a twofold form of schism, one by separation from the immediate bishop, who forms the first link with each one in the chain of unity, and the other, consequent on it, by separation from the centre at which the various chains are joined together. For otherwise, what can be the meaning of his thus addressing Parmenianus: "*Nec Cæcilianus recessit a Cathedra Petri vel Cypriani, vel Majorinus cujus tu cathedram sedes?*" "Nor did Cæcilianus separate himself from the chair of Peter or of Cyprian, but Majorinus did, whose see you occupy." Lib. i. cap. x. p. 10. What, I ask, is the meaning of these words, unless a schism in Africa, at Carthage, was considered a separation not only from the see of that city, on which Cyprian had sat, but also from that of Rome? I therefore conclude, that St. Optatus, in declaring every one a sinful schismatic who sets up a rival chair to that of Peter, spoke not of those in Rome itself, but of any, who, in distant countries, established the independence of their sees.

The learned Father, having thus laid the foundation of his argument, proceeds to apply it to the Donatist controversy, in the following terms: "Therefore, the one chair, which is the first of the properties [of the Church], Peter filled the first, to whom succeeded Linus; to Linus succeeded Clement . . . . [here the saint enumerates all the pontiffs down to his time; then concludes] to Damasus, Siricius, who is now in fellowship with us, with whom the entire world is joined with us in the society of one communion, through the intercourse of *formatæ*. You give an account of the origin of your chair, you who wish to claim to be the holy Church."\* It may be deemed necessary for me to reply to the cavils of the two above-named divines, upon this, as I have done on the preceding part of St. Optatus's text. I am, indeed, dispensed from the task, by the able manner in which I find it has just been done by the Rev. F. C. Husenbeth, who, by his answer to Mr. Poole, has added another to the many claims he already possessed, to the respect and gratitude of British Catholics, and has gained a new title to the character he so justly bears of a sound divine, a ready polemic, and a zealous ecclesiastic.† I will content myself, therefore, with a very few remarks. In laying down the point which he intended to prove, that is, which Church had the marks or properties of the Catholic, St. Optatus never once intimates that he had removed the question from Africa to Rome. For it is evident that he wrote his work for the conviction of the African Donatists, and naturally selected arguments applicable to them. So his marks of the Church are such as would apply in any country. Now, after he has given the argument we have just seen from the chair of

---

\* "Ergo cathedram unicam, quæ est prima de dotibus sedit prior Petrus, cui successit Linus, Lino successit Clemens . . . Damaso Siricius, hodie qui noster est socius, cum quo nobiscum totus orbis, commercio formatarum in una communionis societate concordat. Vestræ Cathedræ vos originem reddite qui vobis vultis sanctam ecclesiam vindicare." Lib. ii. cap. 4, p. 32.

† "St. Cyprian Vindicated, against certain misrepresentations of his doctrine in a work by the Rev. G. A. Poole." Norwich, 1839, p. 64.

Peter, he introduces, simply as an objection to the argument, the Donatists' assertion that they too had a Church and a chair at Rome. "But you also say," he writes, "that you have some part in the city of Rome."\* Surely this is not the way in which the main argument is likely to be introduced. It is evidently nothing more than an objection, which the writer thinks might be thrown in by the adversary, and which he thinks it right to remove before proceeding with the argument. Accordingly, the father shows how little right the Donatists have to consider their African bishop resident in Rome the true representative of the apostolic see, and then, concluding that Peter, the "Prince of the Catholics," (Nostrum Principem), had alone the keys given him, proceeds with the argument on general grounds, by no means applicable to Rome alone. Yet, throughout he continues to argue against the Donatist schism in general, as separated from the chair of Peter, and thereby at once condemned: "Unde est ergo quod claves regni cœlorum vobis usurpare contenditis, qui contra cathedram Petri . . . sacrilegio militatis?" "How is it that you should attempt to usurp the keys of the kingdom of heaven, who are engaged in sacrilegious war against the chair of Peter?" Cap. v. Nay, he even goes farther than this. He had proposed five marks of the true Church, whereby it could be distinguished from all schismatical congregations. The first is the one we have seen, the chair, and he concludes that this is proved to be exclusively his side's, through the chair of Peter. "Igitur de dotibus supradictis cathedra est, ut diximus, prima, quam probavimus per Petrum nostram esse." "Therefore of the above-rehearsed properties, the chair is the first, which we have proved to be ours through Peter." Cap. vi. This surely could not be said, if, as Mr. Poole supposes,† the argument was only of use against Macrobius and his miserable handful of lurking sectarians in Rome. Then, what is still more important, St. Optatus hardly touches upon several of these marks, but contents himself with asserting that he has proved his Church to possess them, through the chair of Peter: "et per cathedram Petri quæ nostra est, per ipsam et ceteras dotes apud nos esse." "And by the chair of Peter which is ours, by it the other properties are with us." Cap. ix. p. 38. By proving therefore this one point, he considered the argument as satisfactory, as if he had fully demonstrated each of the other marks to belong exclusively to his Church. Farther, I will observe, that these characteristics of the true Church were not originally proposed by St. Optatus, but by his Donatist adversary.‡ Now it is not probable that he should by "cathedra" have meant the see of Rome, which they could not, without consummate impudence, pretend to claim; particularly, as we shall see that it was part of their tactics to keep the question on African ground, and decline all reference to the state of foreign Churches. In fine, we find St. Augustine employ the same argument from the succession in the Roman see, where certainly there can be no room for Chillingworth's exceptions. For this

\* "Sed et habere vos in urbe Romæ partem aliquam dicitis." Cap. iv.

† Ap. Husenbeth *ubi sup.*

‡ "Videndum ubi sunt quinque dotes quas tu sex esse dixisti." Lib. ii. cap. ii. St. Optatus afterwards tells us which he excluded to reduce them to five, which, consequently, he admitted. Cap. viii.

Father composed a rude poem, or psalm, which might be sung by the common people of Africa (for he always speaks of other Churches under the title of transmarine) and in this he gives, as the principal evidence against the Donatists, the succession of bishops in the chair of Peter. These are his words :

“ Venite fratres, si vultis ut inseramini in vite,  
Dolor est cum vos videmus præcisos ita jacere.  
Numerate sacerdotes vel ab ipsa Petri sede,  
Et in ordine illo Patrum quis cui successit videte.  
Ipsa est petra, quam non vincunt superbæ inferorum portæ.”

“ Come, brethren, if you wish to be engrafted in the vine,  
It grieves us to see you thus lie cut off.  
Number the priests in the very chair of Peter,  
And see in that order of fathers who succeeded the other.  
This is the rock which the proud gates of hell overcome not.”  
*Contra partem Donati Psalmus versus fin.*

3. It will not, therefore, be surprising to see how, in practice, this simple rule was adopted, for at once ascertaining who were the Catholics, and who the schismatics. St. Ambrose informs us that his brother Satyrus, not yet partaker of the sacred mysteries, being in imminent danger of shipwreck, tied the blessed Eucharist round his neck in an *orarium* or scarf, and fearlessly committed himself to the waves. Arrived on shore, and having experienced the efficacy of this great sacrament, when thus externally applied, he concluded how much more excellent its virtue must be, when actually received into the breast, and therefore ardently desired to be partaker of it. But the schism of Lucifer prevailed in that country; and, therefore, he resolved to be cautious how he communicated with the clergy. “He sent for the bishop, nor did he think there was any true grace save that of true faith. He asked of him whether he agreed with the Catholic bishops, that is with the Roman Church.”\* Such was the simple test, which one, not yet initiated in the mysteries of Christianity, had learnt; he did not enquire into the succession of that particular Church or see, nor whether it taught all that is declared in the creeds, nor whether it was “an independent branch of the Church Catholic;” but simply whether the bishop who came to him kept, or no, communion with the Roman Church. Had Satyrus thus been cast in our days upon the shores of England or Ireland, he certainly would have rejected the ministry of the Establishment-bishops, who claim their rights upon the pretended grounds just rehearsed, and would have admitted the bishop, or vicar, or priest, who could alone have answered affirmatively to his one simple question. Another instance of the application of this easy test, we have in the life of St. Fulgentius written by his disciple. As he was proceeding to the deserts of Thebais, to study virtue from its celebrated anchorites, the Bishop Eulalius thus addressed him : “ You do right thus to aim at per-

\* “ *Advocavit ad se episcopum, nec ullam veram putavit, nisi veræ fidei gratiam : percontatusque ex eo est, utrumnam cum Episcopis Catholicis, hoc est cum Romana Ecclesia conveniret.*” De obitu Satyri Fratris.

fection ; but you know, that without faith it is impossible to please God. The countries which you desire to visit, a perfidious dissension has separated from the communion of the B. Peter ; all those monks, whose wonderful abstinence is celebrated, have not the sacrament of the altar in communion with you. . . . Return, my son, lest, for the sake of perfection of life, you incur danger of right faith.”\* Thus we see, how, even in Egypt, communion with the see of Rome was at once a sufficient test of orthodoxy and participation in the communion of the Catholic Church. It is hardly necessary for us to cite the well-known words of St. Jerome, who, by the same process, resolves the complications of a manifold schism, and decides who is right. “Hinc in tres partes divisa Ecclesia ad se rapere me festinat. . . . Ego interim clamito: si quis Cathedræ Petri jungitur meus est: Meletius, Vitalis, et Paulinus tibi” (the pope), “hærerere se dicunt; possem credere si hoc unus assereret: nunc autem duo mentiuntur aut omnes.” “Hence the Church, divided into three parts, strives to drag me, each to itself. . . . In the meantime, I cry out, If any one is joined to the Chair of Peter, he is mine. Meletius, Vitalis, and Paulinus say that they cleave to you. I might believe it, if one said it; but now two of them, or all three, speak untruly.” Epist. tom. iv. 13. Ed. Maur. Nay, so well understood was this rule, that Eusebius gives an instance of its application by a heathen emperor. For when Paul of Samosata, had refused to obey the decree of deposition pronounced against him by the Council of Antioch, or yield his see to Domnus, the case being referred to Aurelian, he decided that he should be held the true bishop, who had letters (of communion) from the bishop of Rome.†

4. This principle, however, was not merely adopted for convenience of application, as affording a rule, which rude and unenlightened minds could apply, but it was followed by the highest dignitaries of the Church on the most solemn occasions. The Council of Constantinople, under the patriarch Mennas, lays down this rule: “We follow and obey the apostolic see; and those who are in communion with it, we hold in communion; those whom it condemns we likewise condemn.”‡ We have another remarkable declaration of John, patriarch of Constantinople, who, writing to pope Hormisdas, protests that he follows in all things the apostolic see, and preaches all that it has decreed, and therefore hopes to be in one communion with that see, “in which is the entire and perfect solidity of the Christian religion.” Should any one assert that this is said only under the circumstance of the pope’s being at that time acknowledged orthodox by the rest of the Church, and does not contain the maintenance of a principle applicable to all possible cases,

---

\* “Recta facis cupiens meliora sectari; sed scis quoniam Deo sine fide impossibile est placere. Terras ad quas pergere concupiscis a communione B. Petri perfida dissentione separavit; omnes illi monachi quorum prædicatur admirabilis abstinencia, non habent tecum altaris sacramenta communia . . . Revertere, fili, ne vitæ melioris intuitu periculum rectæ fidei patiaris.”—Apud Bolland. 1 Jan. cap. 12.

† Ap. Euseb. H. E. Lib. vii. cap. 30.

‡ Ἡμεῖς γὰρ . . . τῷ ἀποστολικῷ θρόνῳ ἐξακολουθοῦμεν τε, καὶ πειθόμεθα, καὶ τοὺς κοινωνικοὺς αὐτοῦ κοινωνικοὺς ἔχομεν, καὶ τοὺς ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ κατακριθέντας καὶ ἡμεῖς κατακρίνομεν. Labbe Conc. Tom. v. col. 92.

we beg him to attend to the words which immediately follow: "Promising for the future, that whoever are separated from the communion of the Catholic Church, THAT IS WHO CONSENT NOT IN ALL THINGS WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE, their names shall not be recited in the sacred mysteries,"\* the ordinary mark of communion. This at once excludes all idea of the possibility of the see of Rome, or those in unity with it, being considered heretics or schismatics, as the *Tracts for the Times*, professing to deliver the doctrines of antiquity, would pretend is now the case. As I have mentioned this great pope, I cannot help turning the reader's attention to another letter, from the bishop of Nicopolis, to him, in which he holds even stronger language. But as it refers more to the jurisdiction of the pontiffs over the entire world, and to their infallible authority in teaching, than to the necessity of union with them, I will only refer to it in general terms.† St. Gregory the Great has preserved the formulary signed by bishops reclaimed from schism. "I, Bishop . . . willingly and spontaneously have, by the divine grace, returned to the unity of the apostolic see; and . . . I pledge myself, under pain of forfeiture of my order, and under the penalty of anathema I promise to thee, and through thee to St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, and to his vicar, the blessed Gregory, or his successors, never to return to the schism . . . but always to remain in the unity of the Holy Catholic Church, and the communion of the Roman pontiff."‡

We have thus seen the two grounds on which the ancient Church mainly supported an accusation of schism; the two rules which it gave to the faithful for deciding when they were to continue in communion with a body of Christians, however great and however national, who claimed their obedience or their communion. They had not to perplex themselves with doctrinal points, or controversial subtleties—they had simply to ascertain, *first*, whether or no these were held in communion by the rest of the Church, that is by the aggregate of Churches dispersed over the world; and, *secondly*, whether they adhered to the apostolic Roman see. Wherever they found these two conditions verified, there they were to join themselves; wherever they existed not, there was schism, and they were to have no part with those that formed it.§ Now let us apply these two tests to the Anglican Church. In a former tract,

---

\* "In qua est integra Christianæ religionis et perfecta soliditas . . . Promittentes in sequenti tempore, sequestratos a communione Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, id est in omnibus non consentientes sedi Apostolicæ, eorum nomina inter sacra non esse recitanda mysteria." Ibid. tom. iv. col. 1487.

† Ibid. col. 1438.

- ‡ "Ego Episcopus . . . prona et spontanea voluntate ad unitatem Sedis apostolicæ, divina gratia duce, reversus sum . . . Et sub mei ordinis casu spondeo, et anathematis obligatione, atque promitto tibi, et per te S. Patri Apostolorum Principi, atque ejus Vicario Beatissimo Gregorio, vel successoribus ipsius . . . ad schisma . . . nunquam reversurum, sed semper me in unitate S. Ecclesiæ Catholicæ et communione Romani Pontificis permansurum." S. Gregorii M. Opera, tom. ii. p. 1300, ed. Maur.

§ There is an interesting passage in St. Augustine, too long to quote (Cont. Lit. Petil. Lib. ii. cap. 125), in which he unites the two criterions of the Roman and the universal Church's communion, observing that the Church founded upon a rock, is not by reason of this foundation confined to one place, but is spread all over the world.



I proved, that it can shew no communion with the rest of the Christian episcopal world, even taking those criterions of communion which its own approved divines have laid down. And as to the second condition, that of communion with the Roman see, I think there can be no hesitation what to decide, inasmuch as, by a formal act, the English Church, in 1534, disavowed all dependence upon it, and from that moment ceased to communicate with it. Certain it is, that *de facto* that Church has, since that time (excepting the reign of Mary,) held no unity or communication with either Rome or the rest of the Catholic world. And this has nothing to do with the question of doctrine, or any enquiry as to whether the body of the Catholic Church deviated from true faith at Trent, and rendered it imperative then to separate from it; an idea, however, incompatible with what we have already seen above, and much that I could add. For, the separation from unity took place before this, and had no reference to doctrine, farther than the exclusion of the supremacy on Scriptural grounds. The Anglican Church, therefore, spontaneously constituted itself in a state of schism.

At the outset of this tract, I assumed, as a point on which our principal adversaries would agree with us, that a Church, or portion of a Church, thus constituted in schism, however valid its ordination, could have no part in the apostolical succession. For the satisfaction, however of such readers as may not be so well versed in ecclesiastical antiquities, I will now say a few words on the subject.

1. Schism is pronounced by the fathers a dreadful sin, whether in a Church or in individuals, who knowingly persevere in it. St. Augustine thus writes of it: "*Quod autem vos a totius orbis communione separatos videmus (quod scelus et maximum, et manifestum, et omnium vestrum est) si exaggerare velim, tempus me citius quam verba deficient.*" "That you should be found separated from the communion of the entire world (which is a wickedness most grievous, manifest, and chargeable on you all), if I wished to show its aggravation, time would fail me before words." Cont. Lit. Petil. Lib. ii. cap. 8. On another occasion, he calls it "*sacrilegium schismatis quod omnia scelera supergraditur.*" "The sacrilege of schism which transcends all crimes." Cont. Epist. Parmen. Lib. i. cap. 4. St. Fulgentius, in the strongest terms, excludes all schismatics from eternal salvation.\*

2. Farther, they do not admit a possible case that can justify such separation: as they consider the evil done to the Church by schism sufficient to counterbalance any imaginary good to be gained, and equal to any real or imaginary evil to be thereby avoided. St. Irenæus says, that such persons swallow a camel while they strain at a gnat, "for no correction can be made by them equal to the bane of schism."† St. Augustine, speaking of converts made by the Donatists from heathenism, employs this severe language: "*Itaque illos quos sanant*

\* "*Firmissime tene et nullatenus dubites hæreticos atque schismaticos, qui extra Ecclesiam Catholicam præsentem finiunt vitam, in ignem æternum ituros.*" De Fide ad Pet. Biblioth. Vet. Patr. Tom. ix. p. 82, ed. Paris.

† "*Nulla enim ab eis potest fieri tanta correctio, quanta est schismatis perniciēs.*" Lib. iv. cap. 3.

a vulnere idolatriæ, gravius feriunt vulnere schismatis." "Therefore those whom they cure of the wound of idolatry, they more grievously strike with the wound of schism." De Baptismo cont. Donat. Lib. i. cap. 8. We refrain from farther quotations, which we could multiply to any extent.

3. Though the valid exercise of the sacramental power was allowed to such schismatics as preserved the lawful forms, yet its legitimate exercise was never acknowledged. St. Augustine makes the distinction respecting baptism: "Item alia duo dicimus, esse apud Donatistas, baptismum, non autem illic recte accipi." "Likewise two other things we say are among the Donatists; baptism, but that it is not there rightly received." *Ibid.* cap. 3. He had just said that in the Catholic Church, "et esse baptismum, et illic tantum recte accipi." And, on another occasion, he says, of the same sacrament, that, in his opinion, when given under certain circumstances (not then cleared up by a general council), the sacrament would be valid, but "not profitable to life eternal, so long as they remained separated from the Catholic Church."\* Now, the same father repeatedly compares the sacrament of orders with that of baptism, illustrating the latter from the former; so that the same distinction between validity and lawfulness of exercise must be admitted. For instance, "Nam sicut redeuntes, qui priusquam recederent baptizati sunt non rebaptizantur; ita redeuntes, qui priusquam recederent ordinati sunt, non utique rursus ordinantur, sed aut administrant quod administrabant, si hoc ecclesiæ utilitas postulat, aut si non administrant, SACRAMENTUM ordinationis tamen gerunt. . . . Nam neque SACRAMENTUM baptismi, nec SACRAMENTUM DANDI BAPTISMI. . . . Felicianus amisit." "For, as those that return, who, before they separated, had been baptized, are not rebaptized, so they that return, who before they separated had been ordained, are not again ordained, but either resume the ministry they had before, if the service of the Church require it, or if they minister not, yet bear *the sacrament* of orders. For neither the sacrament of baptism, nor *the sacrament of giving baptism*, did Felicianus. . . . lose." *Ibid.* Lib. vii. cap. 2. Ordination, here pronounced a sacrament (contrary to the doctrine of the Anglican Church), is put on the same footing with baptism, in reference to the effects exercised on it by schism, and therefore, however validly, cannot be lawfully or profitably conferred in a Church separated from the unity of faith and religious communion. There is another passage, still more beautiful, that illustrates the doctrine of baptism by that of order and other sacraments, which I cannot forbear quoting, on account of its likewise contradicting the Anglican, and confirming the Catholic, doctrine of the sacraments. It is the following: "Si ergo ad hoc valet quod dictum est in Evangelio, 'Deus peccatorem non audit,' ut per peccatorem sacramenta non celebrentur; quomodo exaudit homicidam deprecantem vel super aquam baptismi, vel super oleum, vel super Eucharistiam, vel super capita eorum quibus manus imponitur? Quæ omnia tamen et fiunt et valent etiam per homicidas. . . etiam in ipsa intus Ecclesia. 'Cum nemo dare possit quod non habet,' quomodo dat homicida Spiritum Sanctum?" "If, therefore, what is said in the Gospe!

\* "Quamquam eis ad vitam æternam non prodesset, si charitate caruissent qua Catholicæ insererentur Ecclesiæ." *Ibid.* Lib. vii. cap. 53.

that 'God hears not sinners' have this force, that *a sacrament* cannot be conferred by a sinner, how does he hear a murderer" (one devoid of charity, as the Father explains it) "praying either over the water of baptism, or over the oil" (confirmation) "or over the Eucharist, or over the heads of those on whom he lays hands" (orders)? "All which, however, are done, and are validly done even by murderers . . . even within the Church itself. Since no one can give that which he has not, *how can a murderer give the Holy Ghost?*" *Ibid.* Lib. v. cap. 20. From which I draw two conclusions opposed to the doctrines of the Tracts, first, that order, as well as confirmation, is a true sacrament, that gives the Holy Ghost; secondly, that it has a form of words, and does not differ from the true sacrament, by consisting only in the imposition of hands.\* The distinction, therefore, holds good between the valid and the lawful exercise and bestowing of orders; so that the former may exist in a schismatical Church; the latter *never can*.

4. Hence, St. Augustine has no hesitation in addressing the following strong language to the Donatist bishops: "If you ask me by what fruits we know you to be rather ravenous wolves, I object to you the crime of schism; which you will deny, but I will instantly prove; for you do not communicate with other nations, and with the Churches founded by the labour of the apostles."†

5. In fine, upon the return of any Donatist bishop to the unity of faith, the Church sufficiently showed how far it was from admitting any right in him to a place in the apostolical succession. The third Council of Carthage, in 397, decreed as follows: First, that what had been decreed in preceding councils be confirmed, "*ne quis Donatistarum cum honore suo recipiatur sed in numero laicorum;*" secondly, that an exception be made in favour of those who had never rebaptized, or who came over to the Catholic communion with their flocks. Thirdly, it was deemed advisable that this decree should not be finally confirmed till the judgment of the transmarine or Italian Church had been obtained.‡ This was similar treatment to that of the Meletians and Novatians, mentioned in my former Tract.§

The voice of antiquity is, therefore, clear and loud upon the claims to apostolical succession of any Church involved in schism, that is, which is not in communion with other Churches, and especially with that of Rome. Implicated in a crime which no possible circumstances can justify; exercising their functions, even when validly, still without profit to

\* Cf. Tract, No. i. p. 3, v. 10; and Dr. Pusey's Lett. Tr. vol. iii. p. 11.

† "Si autem a me quæras quibus fructibus vos potius esse lupos rapaces cognoscamus, objicio schismatis crimen, quod tu negabis, ego autem statim probabo; neque enim communicas omnibus gentibus, et illis ecclesiis apostolico labore fundatis." Cont. Litteras Petil. Lib. ii. cap. 16.

‡ Labbe, tom. iii. col. 1181. St. Augustine thus speaks of this matter, acknowledging the validity of Donatists' orders,—not because hands are imposed, which the theory of the *Tracts* requires, but because a proper *form* of words was used. "Et de episcopis quidem vel clericis recipiendis, alia questio est. Quamvis enim, cum apud vos ordinantur, non super eos invocetur nomen Donati sed Dei, tamen ita suscipiuntur ut videtur paci et utilitati Ecclesiæ convenire." Cont. Cresconium Grammat. Lib. i. cap. 11.

§ Vol. v. p. 289.

the souls of men; styled wolves rather than shepherds; admitted into the Church only as laymen,—can bishops so characterised have been considered by the ancient Church descendants and representatives of the apostles?

My argument ought naturally to close here; but the lessons furnished me by the Donatist schism are not ended. I will, therefore, beg the reader's farther indulgence for several remarkable points of resemblance, not yet noted, between the former schism, and that which unfortunately separates our country from the universal Church.

1. It is singular that, in process of time, there sprung up among the Donatists a High-Church party, the most distinguished of whom seems to have been Ticonius. He saw the absurdity of excluding the numerous Churches dispersed all over the world, from the pale of Christ's true Church, one of whose principal attributes he perceived was universality. This Ticonius demonstrated with great learning and acuteness; but remained blind to the natural consequences to be drawn from his views, namely, that his own Church was schismatical, and that it was his individual duty to abandon it, and become a Catholic. His fellow-churchmen, however, saw this—the Faussetts and Shuttleworths of their day—they were aware that his principles, pushed to their legitimate consequences, would necessarily lead to the abandoning of *Africanism*, and the embracing of Catholicity. Parmenianus was the champion, who undertook to chastise the audacity of this reformer; and not content with writing a letter or pamphlet against him, he had him condemned by a council of his Church. Parmenianus seriously warns him of the danger of maintaining, as he did, that foreign Churches, in communion with Rome, formed part of the true Church of Christ. The Catholics, however, were not slow to step in between the disputants; and giving due commendation to the learning and good intentions of Ticonius, took proper advantage of the truth he had discovered. St. Augustine placed the shield of his vast genius over him, and defended him against Parmenianus.\*

2. The High-Church divines in England maintain that the Irish and English Catholics are schismatics, because they "separate themselves from the Anglican Church, and make congregations contrary to their canonical bishops."† The answer to this assertion resolves itself into the enquiry, whether one is bound to prefer the communion of the universal Church out of one's own country, to that of bishops in it, (all questions of doctrine being left aside), who are not in that communion. This is a case particularly applicable to Portugal at this moment, as it was to England at the time of the Reformation, more than now. Well, St. Augustine seems to have had no doubt on the subject. He observes that Ticonius did not perceive the true consequence of his own principles;—but we must give the holy Father's own words: "Non vidit quod consequenter videndum fuit, illos videlicet in Africa Christianos pertinere ad Ecclesiam toto orbe diffusam, qui utique non istis ab ejusdem orbis communione atque unitate sejunctis, sed ipsi orbi ter-

\* Cont. Epist. Parmen. Lib. i. cap. 1.

† "British Critic," No. xl. p. 435. 'Dub. Rev.," vol. iii. p. 73.

rarum per communionem connecterentur. Parmenianus autem cæterique Donatistæ viderunt hoc esse consequens." "He did not see what as a consequence he should have seen, that those Christians in Africa belonged to the church spread over the whole world, who, indeed, were not connected with those, who were separated from the communion and unity of that world, but were united by communion with the world itself. Parmenianus and the other Donatists saw this consequence." *Ibid.* It is therefore our duty to preserve communion with the general Catholic Church, rather than with the particular church of our country, when that has separated itself from that communion.

3. The writers in the Tracts for the Times, seeing how the argument which they make against English Catholics can be well retorted against French Protestants, are anxious not to introduce into the controversy at home the question of foreign Catholics and separatists from them.\* I observe a similar solicitude in the Donatists of old. Emeritus, one of their bishops, thus expresses this feeling at the conference of Carthage: "Intelligit præstantia tua nihil nobis de peregrinis, nihil nobis de longe positis præjudicare posse, cum inter Afros hoc negotium ventiletur." "Your Excellency understands, that nothing from strangers, nothing from persons living far off, can prejudice us, since this cause is between Africans." *Gesta Collat. Dies 3, No. 99, ad Calc. op. S. Opt.*

4. The same Tracts consider the Catholic bishops as intruders, because sent where there were already bishops in quiet and legitimate possession.† The same complaint was made by the Donatists, that the Catholics sent bishops into dioceses in their possession; which proves, that the Catholics then believed themselves to have the same rights as they have later exercised. Petilianus complains, that in the diocese of Milevis, they had erected three new bishoprics, and that in his own, Delphinus had been appointed in opposition.‡ At the same time, the Catholics severely reprov'd the Donatists for appointing one of their bishops to a see where there was already one in communion with the rest of the church beyond the seas.§ This will apply to the Irish Protestant hierarchy, as the former principle will to the English. In the canonical code of the African Church, we have a decree of a provincial council that, dating from a certain period, the Catholic bishops had to claim jurisdiction over the dioceses held by the Donatists, whether converted to unity, or not.|| This shows, in how little esteem was held a bishop's authority, who communicated not with the rest of the church.

5. We have been struck how the Donatists, while they did not relish this name, had no objection to the national appellation of *Africans*, the *African Church*, which is consequently often applied to their party by the Fathers, without any offensive meaning: at the same time that the latter gloried in bearing no other appellation but that of *Catholic*. In like manner, the denomination *Anglican*, is assumed by our High-Church-

\* Tract 4, p. 6. "Neither do we desire to pass any sentence upon persons of other countries."

† Tract 35. ‡ *Gesta Collat. Dies 1. Ubi sup. p. 258.*

§ St. Aug. contra Epist. Parmen. lib. i. cap. 3.

Integer Codex Canonum Eccl. Afric. ap. Labbe tom. iii. col. 1116.

No. 5.

men, and we willingly accord it; at the same time, we repudiate every designation, save that of *Catholic*.

6. In fine, as from the great Donatist church we have seen how many dissenting sects sprang up, and have therein traced no small resemblance to the fate of the Anglican, so have we a counterpart to our conduct towards this, in the conduct of the Fathers towards the former. For, the great body of the Donatists immediately treated those separatists as schismatics, and severely denounced against them the penalties of schism, precisely as the Tract-writers deal with dissenters from the Anglican church.\* St. Augustine thus retorts upon the Donatists what they said of their separatists: “Cui enim unquam schismatico suo pepercerunt, qui sibi ab orbe terrarum, cujus ipsi schismatici sunt, nimis impudenter parci volunt? cum a vera sola ipsa unitate iustissime schismata puniantur, si eo modo ista punienda sunt.” “For what schismatic from themselves did they ever spare,—they who too impudently wish to be spared by the entire world, from which they are schismatics? whereas, only by the true unity, schisms are most justly punished, if, indeed, they are to be punished in that manner,”—that is, by appeal to the civil power, which this Father strongly blames in them.† This is a severe retort, but not more severe than we have a right to make in our days. The Council of Carthage, seeing the advantage which this argument gave the Catholics, decreed, that envoys should be sent among the Donatists, expressly to inculcate it; since, ‘by it is demonstrated, if they will but attend to it, that it was as wicked for them to be then cut off from the unity of the Church, as they now cry out that it was wicked in the Maximianists to make a schism from them.‡ For Maximianists, read Wesleyans, or Quakers, and you have an exact answer to the complaints in the Tracts. On another occasion, writing to some Donatists, he bids them contrast the great body of bishops from which they separated, with the small number from which *their* schismatics departed. “Multum quidem interest et incomparabiliter distat vel auctoritate vel numero Africana Ecclesia, (observe the name) “si cum ceteris orbis partibus conferatur; et longè minor est, *etiamsi unitas hic esset*, longe omnino minor est comparata ceteris christianis omnibus gentibus, quam pars Maximiani comparata parti Primiani.” “There is much difference and an incomparable distance in number or authority between the African Church, and the remaining parts of the world: and it is far smaller—*supposing unity to exist in it*—it is, indeed, far smaller, compared with all other Christian nations, than the party of Maximianus is, compared to that of Primianus.” Epist. xliii. ol. elxii. cap. 9. Here is an argument well fashioned to our hand to be wielded at pleasure against the arrogant pretensions of the Anglican High-Churchmen, when they on the one hand charge

\* See Tracts 2, p. 3; 4, p. 5; and 29.

† This constant eagerness for the exclusive support of the civil magistrate, might have formed another point of contrast between the African and Anglican churches. Ubi sup. lib. ii. cap. 13.

‡ “Ubi eis demonstratur, si attendere velint, tam inique tunc illos ab Ecclesiæ unitate præciosos, quam inique nunc clamant a se Maximianistas schisma fecisse.” Conc. Carthæ. Africæ univ. ad Calc. S. Opt. p. 211.

others with the mote of schism from a national church, seeing not the beam of schism from the universal church, which fearfully presses on their own cause. Truly, if we would but fill our quiver from the armoury of the Fathers, we should find no difficulty in piercing any mail of proof in which our adversaries may think proper to encase themselves. There is not an argument, a cavil, which they can use, that will not be found answered by anticipation, in the writings of the venerable lights of the ancient Church. Hence, I augur results most favourable to the cause of truth, from the publication of the Fathers, in a form accessible to ordinary readers.

There is one view of the apostolical succession, taken by the authors of the Tracts, which I most cordially admit, because conformable to the doctrine of antiquity. It is that explained in the fifty-fourth Tract, p. 4, in these words: "How had the right interpretation of Scripture been preserved in each of those places?" (Rome, Corinth, &c.) "By the succession of bishops, each in turn handing over to the bishop that followed him what he had himself learned of his predecessors. Thus, it appears that the apostolical succession, where it exists, is a guarantee to the faithful, that the same doctrine is taught which has been taught from the beginning. Now, if we apply this test to the Anglican Church, how certainly it must fail! For it is as clear as noon-day, that the bishops after the so-called Reformation, taught the doctrine *opposite* to that of their immediate predecessors. Cranmer, for instance, blasphemed Transubstantiation under Edward, which had been taught in his see till his time. Where, then, is that evidence of such succession, which perseverance in the same doctrine ought to afford.





# TRACT 20.

[PUBLISHED UNDER THE SUPERINTENDENCE OF THE CATHOLIC  
INSTITUTE OF GREAT BRITAIN.]

---

THE  
**HIGH-CHURCH CLAIMS:**  
OR, A SERIES OF PAPERS

ON  
THE OXFORD CONTROVERSY, THE HIGH-CHURCH THEORY  
OF DOGMATICAL AUTHORITY, ANGLICAN CLAIM  
TO APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION, &c.

BY NICHOLAS WISEMAN, D.D.

---

N<sup>o</sup>. 6.

OCCASIONED BY THE PUBLICATION OF THE "REMAINS  
OF THE LATE REV. H. FROUDE, M.A."

*(From the "Dublin Review.")*



[Stereotyped for the Catholic Institute of Great Britain.];

---

LONDON:

Sold by all Catholic Booksellers, price One Penny, or Five Shillings  
per Hundred for gratuitous distribution

## TRACT No. 6.

OCCASIONED BY THE PUBLICATION OF THE "REMAINS  
OF THE LATE REV. R. H. FROUDE, M.A."

---

It is not often that the leaders of opinions let the public into a view of their secret counsels and feelings; but when they do, we think it does credit to the uprightness and sincerity of their intentions. It shows that they wish us to be acquainted with the secret springs of their actions, and even to peer behind the veil which generally conceals the man from our sight, while we are viewing only his productions. Nay, the more unreservedly the human weaknesses of the individuals are revealed, and the more the feeling is expressed, that with their exposure, or in spite of it, their cause will succeed, the more highly we shall estimate their confidence in the correctness of their views, and the disinterestedness of their zeal in propagating them. These reflections have suggested themselves, by the perusal of Mr. Froude's *Remains*. He was, while living, one of the most enthusiastic members of the theological school, from which the *Tracts for the Times* have emanated. He died in 1836, having attained only the age of thirty-three; and was thus prevented from arriving at that full maturity of religious ideas which was evidently preparing in his mind, and bearing him onward towards the perception of many Catholic truths. His surviving friends have thought it expedient to collect his *Remains*, and give them to the world in two volumes. As the second of these consists principally of sermons, in which, though there is much to commend, there is nothing sufficiently interesting to detain the reader, I will confine myself entirely to the first, which contains his journals, private thoughts, and letters to friends.

A preface of twenty-two pages betrays the editors' anxiety to repel a twofold charge; one against themselves, the other against their deceased friend. In the first place, they seem to fear lest considerable censure may be cast upon them for the publication of Mr. Froude's crude theories, and trivial self-accusations, as something approaching to a sacrilegious violation of the rights of friendship. I am not disposed to take part either among the reprovers, or among the applauders of the act: I cannot but feel that I should have scarcely ventured to deal as they have done, with any one who had tranquilly looked up to me with a confiding heart, and the peace of whose memory I should have wished to consult. When one whose noble and public proofs of great virtue far outweigh the errors of youth, or whose public reputation makes his example, when evil, a warning, and when repentant, a reparation and an encouragement;—when one, in short, like St. Augustine, boldly, but humbly, reveals to the eyes of the Church the wretchedness of his early sinful life, we admire in awe the strange manifestation of a sublime spirit of Christian virtue, and we bless the Divine wisdom that hath caused it to be vouchsafed to us. But the struggles of one who has not compensated his weaknesses by any noble results; who

withdraws from our sight a combatant, and not a victor; who only presents us the spectacle of a frail nature, such as we all may have, wrestling with daily and anxious trials, and not overcoming them, these, too, not spontaneously exhibited, but transferred from the closet to the public arena, have neither the grandeur nor the instruction of the other lesson. Still, there may be reasons unknown to me, who am not in the secrets of the party, to justify, certainly in their own eyes, this sacrifice of private feeling to a sense of public utility. Some, the editors have given in the preface (pp. vi.—ix.), and it is for the public to judge of them;—I think, in fact, that they would have materially strengthened their reasoning by the following passage in his Letters to Friends:

“There was a passage in a letter I have just received from my father, that made me feel so infinitely dismal, that I must write to you about it. He says you have written to him to learn something about me, and to ask what to do with my money. *It really made me feel as if I was dead, and you were sweeping up my remains; and, by the by, if I was dead, why should I be cut off from the privilege of helping on the good cause?* I don't know what money I have left—little enough, I suspect; but, whatever it was, I am superstitious enough to think that any good it could do *in honorem ‘Dei et sacrosanctæ matris ecclesiæ,’* would have done something too *in salutem animæ meæ.*”—vol. i. p. 388.

From these words, it appears that the author did contemplate his power of doing good to the cause wherein he was so ardently engaged, even after his death.

The censure upon their friend, which the editors foresee, is that which forms their bugbear in all their theological researches,—that of approaching too near the Catholic, or, as they call it, Romanist doctrines. They are therefore careful to distinguish between two meanings attached to the term: “either a predilection for the actual system of the Church of Rome, as distinguished from other parts of Christendom, and particularly for the English Church,\* or an overweening value for outward religion, for sacraments, Church polity, public worship, &c.” (p. x.) With the first definition of Romanism in view, the editors proceed to prove that Mr. Froude could not have this laid to his charge. To this I assent. That there must have unfortunately been some barrier between him and the Catholic Church, every one will imagine, who knows that he died without its pale. But I must express my conviction, that the editors have not done much credit to their friend by the manner in which they have thought it right to shield his memory from the charge. It consists in a careful collection of some of the most hasty, unhandsome, and decidedly unreasonable, judgments and opinions of the author, respecting chiefly what he saw in his travels. I consider the dilemma worth illustrating, that either they were so much at a loss for a set-off against his noble avowal of many Catholic truths, that they must be content with the worst specimens of his reasoning powers, or

---

\*If the reprehensible system, misnamed by these gentlemen Romanism, consist of all those parts of the Catholic religion which differ from the English Church, how comes it that so many of its practices, disciplines, and even dogmas, are objects of envy and covetous desire to these very writers and their friend Mr. Froude?

else that the wall of separation between him and the Catholic Church, as well as the cords which bound him to his own sect, were too flimsy and weak, as being mere matters of prejudice and false feeling, to have long resisted the evidence of truth. In either case, he presents a melancholy instance of how small a grain of prepossession is thought sufficient to overbalance a solid weight of good arguments. For instance, take the following proof of the author's not being a Romanist:—

“How whiggery has by degrees taken up all the filth that has been secreted in the fermentation of human thought! Puritanism, Latitudinarianism, *Poper*y, Infidelity; they have it all now, and good luck to them!”—*Pref.* p. xi.

Truly this sentence betrays alienation enough from our religion; but I do not think it does much honour to the writer's good sense, to wedge this between the various brood of the Reformation. Neither is it evidence of more than a political, hot-brained antagonism, rather than of a sober, rational judgment. Again: “I have seen the priest laughing when at the confessional; and, indeed, it is plain that, unless they made light of very gross immorality, three-fourths of the population [of Naples] would be excommunicated.” (p. xiii.) Really, is this passage worthy of being pressed into the editors' service? Had Mr. Froude never witnessed disrespectful behaviour in his own Church? If he ever had, would he have allowed of the generalization to all his establishment, implied in the quotation against our hierarchy! Mr. Froude had no evidence that a confession was actually going on, when he saw the priest at Naples laugh; for persons often go to the confessional to speak to the priest on urgent matters. But I think I have further to complain of the editors, for leaving us to understand, by the form of their quotation, that Mr. Froude witnessed some terrible scenes of gross immorality, involving three-fourths of a population of 300,000 souls. Now I think the sentence which follows the passage quoted, but which in this extract is prudently concealed under a few unmeaning dots, would have at once opened the eyes of the sensible reader to the character of the scenes of gross immorality intimated; scenes in which, perhaps, he has himself joined, without being conscious that he ought to be excommunicated. The hiatus should be supplied as follows:—“I think people are injudicious who talk against the Roman Catholics for worshipping saints, and honouring the Virgin, images, &c.: these things may be idolatrous—I cannot make up my mind about it; but, to my mind, *it is the carnival*, which is real, practical idolatry; as it is written, ‘the people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.’” (p. 294.) We might ask, are all the English who frequent a fair, or a theatre, or a ball, to be accounted idolaters? Why not, if the poor Neapolitans are, for their carnival sports? In fine, before he left Naples, he corrected what he had so unreflectingly written concerning the character of the priests, saying that he “could not be quite confident of his information, as it affected them.” I think not; and farther acquaintance with them, or inquiries concerning them, would have still further diminished his confidence in it. He even owns that his opinion concerning the idolatry of the Italians is an opinion grounded upon “a generalization, for which he has not sufficient data.” (p. xiv.)

I think I am justified in saying that proofs of Mr. Froude's disinclination to Catholicity must have been very scarce, to have led the editors to bring together these superficial observations, made during a brief residence in a Catholic city, not generally reputed the most edifying in its conduct. These, however, will not bear comparison with the growing and expanding tendency of his mind towards everything Catholic; and I cannot help feeling, as I peruse his later declarations, that the passages brought so prominently forward by his editors, would have been among those which, dying, he would have wished to blot. My readers shall soon judge for themselves.

The "Extracts from Journal" present us a picture, at once pleasing and distressing, of a mind yearning after interior perfection, yet at a loss about the means of attaining it; embarked on an ocean of good desires, but without stars or compass by which to steer its course. The minute scrutiny into the motives of his actions, the distress occasioned by discovering his relapses into faults which most would overlook, show a sensitiveness of conscience in the youthful writer, far more honourable to him, and far more interesting to us, than abilities of a much higher order than what he really possessed, could ever have appeared. There are passages in the Journals which will come home to the inward experience of any one that has looked narrowly into the more mysterious workings of his own mind, and sought to unravel that maze of apparently conflicting influences which seem to impel him towards a single action, leaving him afterwards in sad perplexity which of them it was that moved him to it, or gave colour and character thereto. How far it may be advisable to commit to paper, even for personal benefit, these investigations of our most secret tribunal, we may have considerable doubt; and instructive as is their record in the case before us, in nothing is it more so than in the proof it gives us of the necessity of guidance for the conscience and heart, such as the institutions of the Catholic Church alone provide. In the account which he gives of his own infirmities, of his almost fruitless attempts to subdue them, and of the pain and anxiety produced by his solitary struggles, he presents a picture familiar to the experienced eye of any spiritual director in our Church, and a state fully described and prescribed for by the numerous writers whom we possess, upon the inward life, and the direction of consciences. Many are they who are tossed in the same billows of secret tribulation, many are they who are bewildered in the same mazes of mental perplexity; but they have not at least the additional horrors of darkness and night. Ere they can sink, a hand is stretched out, if they will only grasp it. The troubles and trials which haunt minds constituted like Mr. Froude's, many a skilful guide would have shown him to be mere illusory phantoms, that only serve to turn the attention away from serious dangers, or from solid good,—snares cast, by a restlessness of spirit, upon the path, to entangle the feet that tread it.

In fact, we miss throughout these Journals those higher thoughts, and those more vigorous springs of action, which might have been naturally expected in one determined to attain, even by extraordinary efforts, a sublimer degree of virtue. When we read the lives of our great saints, we see a certain proportion kept between the progress of

their interior perfection, and the rigour of their austerities. It is only in extraordinary cases, that the first steps in a saintly life are marked by penitential severities of a higher order: these are gradually increased with an increasing humility and love of suffering. Moreover, there has ever been a rule and principle to guide them throughout, such as the appointed times and methods prescribed by the Church, the direction of prudent and experienced men, or even a self-imposed, but well-observed method of regular life. But the young man, whose autobiography is presented to us in this volume, seems to have had no idea of proportion, or of definite object, in his austerities. Fasting seems to have been considered as an end, and not a means, and practised for its own sake; or, if intended for the augmentation of some other good gift, there was a mere vague and indefinite notion of its power, without a specific aim, or a sense of the necessity of other and more important spiritual exercises. Hence we find no mention of any steady, regular system of daily meditation, such as has always been practised by all who wish to train themselves up to virtue in our Church, or of daily examination into the state of the conscience, independently of the equivocal plan of registering failings, from time to time, for future perusal. His fasting is without rule or reference to becoming order, unaccompanied by that retirement, and more serious occupation, which should naturally go with it. It was observed on the Sunday (p. 16), contrary to the usages of the ancient Church; and on any other day, subject to the remorse of being broken through at evening, on the temptation of company, or some other unforeseen seduction (p. 42, 49).

He even went beyond these more usual austerities, and attempted those which a prudent director would have forbidden, or would have reserved for a more disciplined state of mind. This will be shown by the following extracts:—

“I was not up till half-past six; slept on the floor, and a nice uncomfortable time I had of it. I had on a mustard plaster, nearly three hours after I returned from Lloyd’s; could not bear it longer: I believe it has answered. Tasted nothing to-day till tea-time; and then only one cup, and dry bread. Somehow, it has not made me at all uneasy.” (p. 30.) “Nov. 12. Felt great reluctance to sleep on the floor last night, and was nearly arguing myself out of it; was not up till half-past six.” (p. 44.)

The consequence of all this irregular and undirected austerity, into which with youthful eagerness he rushed, was, that instead of deriving thence vigour of thought, and closer intimacy with sound spiritual feelings, his spirit, on the contrary, flagged, and at length grew weary, and so fell into that despondency which failure will produce in sensitive minds. This discouragement is visible in many parts of his Journals; for instance:—

“Yet I cannot venture to give myself credit for abstinence, as I found so little difficulty, that, unless my appetite is more subdued than I can suppose, I could not have been hungry. I do not feel any satisfaction in the day; for though I have fasted, I have not turned it to any end for which the fast was instituted. My thoughts have been very wandering. I have been neither able to read nor pray: I could not even fix my mind on Mr. Bonnel’s reflections on that very subject. I have not watched myself close enough to be able to record the weaknesses of this evening, but have a general impression that I have not been what I ought.” (p. 34.)

I broke my fast at tea, of which, however, I allowed myself to make a meal. I deliberately think that it will be better for me to discontinue for a time these voluntary self-denials; I am quite exhausted by them, little as they have been, and feel incapacitated for executing my duties. Very likely, after a short respite, I may return with greater vigour; and I think the impression already made will not go off in a moment. Nov. 18. I have slackened my rules to-day, and let go my dreamy feelings, that have been keeping me up. Bad as I am, it seems as if I might, not indeed be too penitent, but penitent in a wrong way; abstinences and self-mortifications may themselves be a sort of intemperance; a food to my craving after some sign that I am altering. They ought not to be persevered in, further than as they are instrumental to a change of character in things of real importance; and the lassitude which I have felt lately, is a sign that they will do me no good just for the present. It is curious to see, how, by denying one affection, we gratify another; and how hard it is to keep a pure motive for anything. The sensible way is to watch for our predominant affection, as each gets the uppermost, and give it our chief attention: mine, just now, is impatience at finding myself remain the same, in spite of any difference of conduct I adopt. But, while I give up punishing myself in my eating, I must be very careful not to indulge."—p. 49-50.

The want of direction and counsel, which the Catholic Church so eminently supplies, is evident from his letters. Thus, he writes to Mr. Keble:—"The fact is, that I have been in a very strange way all the summer; and having had no one to talk to about the things which have bothered me, I have been every now and then getting into fits of enthusiasm or despondency." (p. 204.) This will be the inevitable result of the absence of control upon a fervid mind, that seeks after a degree, or rather a character, of excellence, superior to that of others around it. In fact, Mr. Froude discovered that most important principle, that obedience to the ordinances of authority gives the great merit to the first degrees of penitential works, those which belong to ordinary Christians, such, that is, as have not reached the perfection of ascetic life. The same friendly monitor, just referred to, seems to have solemnly undeceived him on this important point. For in 1827, he writes to him as follows:—

"I am glad of your advice about penance, for my spirit was so broken down, that I had no vigour to go on even with the trifling self-denials I had imposed on myself; besides, I feel that, though it has in it the colour of humility, it is in reality the food of pride. Self-imposed, it seems to me quite different from when imposed by the Church; and even fasting itself, to weak minds, is not free from evil, when, however secretly it is done, one cannot avoid the consciousness of being singular."—p. 212.

This it is that forms at once the great merit and the great support of those who profess the monastic institute; and the absence in Protestantism of that strong principle of docility and obedience which the Catholic Church inculcates, is an insuperable bar to the introduction of it among Anglicans, which Mr. Froude and his friends seem to have anxiously desired.

While he seems so taken up, through his Journals, with examination of his fasts and austerities, we miss from his pages those cheerful views of religion which result from confidence and love; from the consciousness of a strong will to do God service, and an humble reliance on His mercy, which will measure that, rather than our success. What

snatches there are of prayer, bear more the character of one sinking under the fatigue of foiled attempts, and troubled with anxiety from hopelessness of success, than of a young and trusting mind, that presses forward to a work it deems glorious,—the work of God and His religion.

But all these faults, which flowed from the religion to which he unfortunately belonged, only beget sympathy in our minds, when reading his ingenuous journals. I see no room for the levity and ridicule with which they have been commented on by some periodicals, nor for the harsh censures of his character, which they have based upon them. I certainly think that his ardent way—more, perhaps, of expressing himself, than of feeling—leads him often to a harsh and reckless manner of speaking of others, that must give an unfavourable impression regarding his character, which I have every reason to believe was amiable and gentle. Still, there are so many fine points about him; so much distrust of himself, blended with no inconsiderable powers of genius; so much independence of thought, coupled with deference to the sentiments of others, whom he esteemed more learned or more virtuous than himself; so much lightness of spirit, united to such seriousness of mind upon religious truths;—in fine, so earnest and sincere a desire to improve and perfect himself, that our feelings lead us to pass lightly over his faults, and dwell with pleasure upon his finer qualities. If I have dilated somewhat upon the former, it has been that I considered them the result of the system to which he was by education attached, and which is alone accountable for them.

As, however, he increased in years, his mind began to open to the defects and wants of that system, and boldly to conceive the necessity of correcting them. In this he ran manifestly before his fellows, and seemed only to have been prevented by his premature death from reaching the goal of Catholic unity, to which we sincerely hope they are tending. Mr. Froude was one of the contributors to the *Tracts for the Times*; but does not seem to have been satisfied with the point at which the principles of that collection stopped short. He evidently saw that consistency of reasoning ought to have carried his friends further than they ventured to go; and I think he was prepared to go to the extreme of logical deductions. But I must methodize my observations.

A symptom, which begins at first more faintly, and then deepens in intensity towards the end of his life, is a disgust for Protestantism and the so-called Reformation. In 1833, we have the following sentiments:—

“Sept. 8. I have been reading a good deal about the Reformation in Queen Elizabeth’s time: it is shocking indeed. What do you think of my contemplating *An Apology for the Early Puritans*? I really think they deserve much commiseration. The Episcopalians did not claim ‘*jus divinum*’; indeed, Queen Elizabeth and her party considered her as the origin of ecclesiastical power.”—p. 325.

When at Barbados, whither he went for his health, he applied himself to the study of the older controvertists and Reformers, and certainly in no wise increased his respect for them. Thus he writes in 1834:—



"Imprimis, as to —'s friend, Jewell. He calls the mass 'your cursed paltry service;' laughs at the apostolical succession, both in principle and as a fact; and says that the only succession worth having is the succession of doctrine.\* He most distinctly denies the sacrament of the Lord's supper to be a means of grace, as distinguished from a pledge, calling it a 'phantasie of Mr. Harding's.† He says, the only keys of the kingdom of heaven are *instruction and correction*,‡ and the only way they open the kingdom is by touching men's consciences; that binding and retaining is preaching that 'God will punish wickedness;' loosing and remitting that 'God will pardon, on repentance and faith;§ justifies Calvin for saying, that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper 'were superfluous,' if we remembered Christ's death enough without it; || ridicules the consecration of the elements, and indirectly explains that the way the body and blood are verily received, is that they are *received into our remembrance*.¶ I have got chapter and verse for all this, and would send you my extracts, if it was not too much trouble to copy them out. Certainly the Council of Trent had no fair chance of getting at the truth, if they saw no alternative between transubstantiation and Jewellism."—p. 339.

This was in January; in October, his dislike of the godly work of reformation, and its authors, had manifestly increased. For he writes concerning them as follows:—

"As to the Reformers, I think worse and worse of them. Jewell was what you would in these days call an irreverent dissenter. His 'Defence of his Apology' disgusted me more than almost any work I have read. Bishop Hicke and Dr. Brett I see go all lengths with me in this respect, and I believe Laud did. The preface to the *Thirty-nine Articles* was certainly intended to disconnect us from the Reformers."—p. 379.

The following is two months later:—

"When I get your letter, I expect a rowing for my Roman Catholic sentiments. Really I hate the Reformation and the Reformers more and more, and have almost made up my mind that the rationalist spirit they set afloat is the *ψευδοπροφήτης* of the Revelations. I have a theory about the beast, and woman too, which conflicts with yours; but I will not inflict it on you now. I have written nothing for a long time, and only read in a desultory, lounging way; but really it is not out of idleness, for I find that the less I do, the better I am; and so, on principle, resist doing a good deal that I am tempted to."—p. 389.

The subjoined extract will prove his opinion of the worthies in whose honour his own university has been proposing to erect a church.

"Also, why do you praise Ridley?" [in the *Tracts for the Times*, I presume, where he receives the epithet of the *cautious*, in regard to the doctrine of the Eucharist.] "Do you know sufficient good about him to counterbalance the fact that he was the associate of Cranmer, Peter Martyr, and Bucer? N.B. How beautifully the *Edinburgh Review* has shown up Luther, Melancthon, and Co.! What good genius has possessed them to do our dirty work? *Pour moi*, I never mean, if I can help it, to use any phrases even, which can connect me with such a set. I shall never call the Holy Eucharist 'the Lord's supper;' nor God's priests 'ministers of the word;' or the altar 'the Lord's table,' &c. &c.; innocent as such phrases are in themselves, they have been dirtied; a fact of which you seem oblivious on many occasions. Nor shall I even abuse the Roman Catholics, *as a Church*, for anything, except excommunicating us."—p. 394.

\* Def. of Apol. p. 120, 123, 139, ed. 1611.

+ Ib. p. 208.

‡ Ib. 149, 153.

§ Ib. 151.

|| Ib. 152, 155.

¶ Ib. 210, 212.

In order to measure the progress which his mind had made in justly appreciating the characters of the Fathers of the Reformation, we may go back to an earlier period than any from which we have quoted, and see the cautious and measured language in which he thought it right to speak of them. The following is from a letter dated Jan. 29, 1832 :—

"I have been very idle lately ; but have taken up Strype now and then, and have not increased my admiration of the Reformers. *One must not speak lightly of a martyr ; so I do not allow my opinions to pass the verge of scepticism.* But I really do feel sceptical whether Latimer was not something in the Bulteel line ; whether the Catholicism of their formulæ was not a concession to the feelings of the nation, with whom Puritanism had not yet become popular, and who could scarcely bear the alterations which were made ; and whether the progress of things in Edward the Sixth's minority may not be considered as the jobbing of a faction. *I will do myself the justice to say, that those doubts give me pain, and that I hope more reading will in some degree dispel them.* As far as I have gone, too, I think better than I was prepared to do of Bonner and Gardiner. Certainly the *ἡθoς* of the Reformation is to me a *terra incognita* ; and I do not think that it has been explored by any one that I have heard talk about it."—p. 251.

We have already seen how far subsequent reading was from dispelling these innocent doubts concerning those men, and how very much more daring his language became, when speaking of such *martyrs*.

With the growing dislike, or rather hatred, of the Reformation and its authors, we trace an increasing approach to Catholic truths and practices. General expressions to this effect will be found in the passages already quoted. We may contrast with his sentiments respecting the Reformers, his judgment of one of their great opponents : "The person whom I like best of all I have read about, is Cardinal Pole. He seems a hero of an ideal world ; an union of chivalrous and Catholic feeling, like one hopes to find people, before one reads about them." (p. 254.) The following passage will show how disposed he had become, in 1834, to judge favourably of Catholic practices, even when not clearly discoverable in the writings of the early ages, and to cast the burthen of disproving them upon others, rather than call us for evidence.

"You will be shocked at my avowal, that I am every day becoming a less and less loyal son of the Reformation. It seems to me plain, that, in all matters that seem to us indifferent, or even doubtful, we should conform our practices to those of the Church, which has preserved its traditionary practices unbroken. We cannot know about any seemingly indifferent practice of the Church of Rome, that it is not a development of the apostolic *ἡθoς* ; and it is to no purpose to say that we can find no proof of it in the writings of the six first centuries ; they must find a *disproof*, if they would do anything."—p. 336.

It may be well, however, to examine the progress of his views on specific subjects. And first as to the blessed Eucharist. We find him early desirous of going beyond the timid phraseology of his party, and admitting in the priesthood such power as the Catholic Church alone admits. The following is in 1833 :—

"*Sept. 16.* — has sent me your resolutions for our association, which I think excellent, only I should like to know why you flinch from saying that the power of making the body and blood of Christ is vested in the successors of the Apostles : it seems to me much simpler, and less open to cavil, than 'continuance, and due application of the sacrament.' "—p. 326.

In another place he supports the use of this phraseology, as applied to the Blessed Sacrament, from the words of Bishop Bull, who writes: "We are not ignorant that the ancient Fathers generally teach that the bread and wine in the Eucharist, by and upon the consecration of them, do become, and *are made*, the body and blood of Christ." (p. 363.) In 1835, he condemns what he calls the Protestant doctrine of the Eucharist in strong terms. These are his words:—

"I am more and more indignant at the Protestant doctrine on the subject of the Eucharist; and think that the principle on which it is founded is as proud, irreverent, and foolish, as that of any heresy, even Socinianism."—p. 391.

Still more, writing to the author of the *Christian Year*, he blames him for denying that Christ is in the hands of the priest or receiver, as well as in his heart.

"Next as to the Christian year. In the [*hymn for the*] fifth of November ..... 'there present in the heart, not in the hands,' &c. How can we possibly know that it is true to say, 'not in the hands?' Also [*in the hymn*] on the Communion.....you seemed cramped by Protestantism."—p. 403.

These passages show how far prepared he was to outstrip his friends in approximation to Catholic doctrines and Catholic expressions. For when once it is conceded that by the words of consecration bread and wine *are made* the body and blood of Christ; and that in such sort, as that not only is the body present when received, but that it may be actually said to be in the hand of one who holds the sacred species; very little indeed, beyond the acceptance of fitting forms of expression, and terms to embody these doctrines, is wanting for the complete assent to the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist. To these passages we may add other two, in which the Liturgy, or Mass, is spoken of. The first occurs in p. 366, where he says that the Liturgies "are a death-blow to Protestantism, if Palmer is right about their antiquity and independence." The other shows still more clearly his judgment of the Mass, and of the somewhat disparaging manner in which it had been mentioned by his friends. Speaking of some one in Barbados, he says:—

"For a long time he looked on me as a mere sophister; but Perceval conciliated his affections with Palmer's chapter on the Primitive Liturgies; and I verily believe that he would now gladly consent to see our communion service replaced by a good translation of the liturgy of St. Peter; a name which I advise you to substitute, in your notes to —, for the obnoxious phrase 'mass-book.' "—p. 387.

The state of celibacy, and with it the monastic life, seems also to have been an object of his admiration. "It has lately come into my head," he writes, "that the present state of things in England makes an opening for reviving the monastic system. I think of putting the view forward under the title of *Project for reviving Religion in great Towns*. Certainly colleges of unmarried priests (who might, of course, retire to a living, when they could and liked), would be the cheapest possible way of providing effectively for the wants of a large population....

---

\* Mr. Froude seems to have had a practical, no less than a theoretical, admiration of the Breviary; as appears from the request in one of his letters, that his friends would send him out to Barbados "the parts *autumnalis* and *hyemalis* of his Breviary." (p. 365.) I should be curious to know how the recital of this office is performed by those who reject prayers to saints, especially to modern ones.

I must go about the country, to look for the stray sheep of the true fold : there are many about, I am sure ; only that odious Protestantism sticks in people's gizzards." (p. 323.) Would that these sentiments had been expressed by a Catholic, in whose mouth they would have had more consistency and promise ! If an Anglican thinks that England is ripe for the diffusion of the monastic institute, and believes it to be the most efficacious means for reviving religion, how much more may we be allowed to think the same, with whom that mode of life is not an experiment, but a well-trying and already organized system. But, in the latter part of his scheme, I see nothing but what has a thousand times crossed my mind, and been a subject of my earnest desires and meditations. A central college, or community of priests (the distinctive of *unmarried* is unnecessary with us), bound together no longer than health, inclination, or other circumstances, permitted them ; living together under a mild but steady rule ; who should extend their labours over the whole country ; appears to me the most effectual means for diffusing our holy religion where it is not yet well known, and animating it to greater fervour where it is professed. The institute which best embraces all my ideas upon this matter, is the *Oratorio* of St. Philip Neri, which both in Italy and in France has produced so many men eminent for zeal, learning and apostolic spirit. In this institute, secular clergy live together without any bond besides that of voluntary aggregation, and devote themselves to the various duties of preaching and instructing at home and abroad. It seems to possess all the advantages of the admirable institution of St. Vincent of Paul, without those severer restraints, and irrevocable engagements which may deter many from joining it. I speak not only of my own conviction, but the expressed opinion of many more experienced in the missionary life, and the result of long attention to results attained, when I say that a body of clergy devoted to the task of going from town to town, relieving the overworked local clergy of part of their labours, by giving well-prepared and systematic courses of instruction, and arousing the slumbering energies of congregations, in which stronger excitement is required than the voice of ordinary admonition. By this means, I have no doubt that many stray sheep would be brought back to the true fold, and "that odious Protestantism," which "sticks in people's gizzards," be thence salubriously extracted. In France, the saintly American Bishop Flaget has been visiting several dioceses to preach in favour of the *Œuvre de la Propagation* : and, though his tour has been limited, I have it on authority that it will have had the effect of raising the funds of that beautiful institution from seven hundred thousand to upwards of a million of francs. I have also reason to know that he is bent upon having such a system as we have suggested, of moveable missionaries, established in America, as the only means of propagating the Catholic religion on a great scale. In fact, it is the true *Apostolic* method, first taught by our Lord, when he sent his seventy-two before his face, during his own life-time, and afterwards deputed the twelve to the nations of earth : and subsequently practised by all those who, imitating their example, and copying their virtues, have gone forth to preach the Gospel to those that sit in darkness. It was the plan pursued in our regard, not only to rescue our Saxon fathers from paganism, but, what

is still more in point, for undeceiving the earlier Christians as to the errors of Pelagianism. Difficulties, some suggested by timidity, others by prudence, may, I am aware, be raised against this proposal. Some will fear fanaticism, or excessive zeal; but this will be easily prevented by wholesome regulation, authoritative control, and, still more, by a system of training and preparation, that shall act on the feelings and mind, as well as on the outward forms to be observed. Others will say, where are the instruments, and the means, for such an undertaking? the individuals who will dedicate themselves to the laborious, self-denying duties it will impose, and the funds requisite for conducting it? I answer, let but the word be given, by the authority under whose guidance it must be ever carried on,—let an accordant plan be concerted, giving to all the benefit of such an institution,—and I will engage that no difficulties will be incurred on any of these grounds. There is abundance of zeal and activity in the Catholic body, and especially among its clergy, to insure success to any plan, based upon experience and approved methods, for propagating truth, and combating error. While the Anglicans would have everything to prepare, and even to design, before they could set on foot such a system as Mr. Froude proposes, we *have* much already in train, and should require but little for immediate execution. It would even appear that the Mendicant orders were the favourite scheme of Mr. Froude and his friends.\* We defy Protestantism to institute or support them.

I come now to the great doctrine of the *Tracts for the Times*,—ecclesiastical authority, both in matters of jurisdiction and of teaching; and it will be easy to show how evidently dissatisfied Mr. Froude was with the principles and arguments of his party,—of the inconsistency of staying where they were,—and of the logical extension which their arguments would naturally receive. In 1834, he thus writes to his friend Mr. Newman:—

“Does not the Archbishop of Canterbury claim patriarchal authority (*qualem qualem*) over as large a portion of the globe as ever the Bishop of Rome did? and are not the colonial bishops just as much exonerated from their oath of canonical obedience, by proving that there is no universal bishop recognised in Scripture, as ever Craumer was?”—pp. 339, 340.

This is certainly a just argument, retorted upon his friends. The Archbishop of Canterbury considers himself the primate of the East and West Indian Churches, as well as those of our North American colonies. The arguments whereby the Reformers justified their separation from Rome, would as well disprove this assumed superiority. Our next quotation must be a long one: it is from a letter to Mr. Keble, written in 1835, just a year after the former, and objects to the reasoning of the *Tracts* respecting the Anglican claims to authority in their Church. It will require no commentary from us.

“And first, I shall attack you for the expression, ‘the Church teaches so and so,’ which I observe is in the Tract equivalent to ‘the Prayer-Book, &c., teaches us so and so.’ Now suppose a conscientious layman to inquire on what

---

\* “Your old project about the Mendicant Orders was the sort of thing; though, perhaps, something connected with later times would tell more just at present.” (p. 397.) See also, on celibacy and religious orders, the same page (another letter), and p. 408.

grounds the Prayer-Book, &c., are called the teaching of the Church, how shall we answer him? Shall we tell him that they are embodied in an act of parliament? So is the Spoliation Bill. Shall we tell him that they were formerly enacted by convocation in the reign of Charles II? But what especial claim had this convocation, &c., to monopolise the name and authority of the Church? Shall we tell him that all the clergy assented to them ever since their enactment? But to what interpretation of them have all, or even the major part, of the clergy assented? For if it is the assent of the clergy that makes the Prayer-Book, &c. the teaching of the Church, the Church teaches only that interpretation of them to which all, or at least the majority of the clergy, have assented; and, in order to ascertain this, it will be necessary to inquire, not for what may seem to the inquirer to be their real meaning, but for the meaning which the majority of the clergy have, in fact, attached to them. It will be necessary to poll the Hoadleians, Puritans, and Laudians, and to be determined by most votes. Again, supposing him to have ascertained these, another question occurs: why is the opinion of the English clergy, since the enactment of the Prayer-book, entitled to be called the teaching of the Church, more than that of the clergy of the sixteen previous centuries? or, again, than the clergy of France, Italy, Spain, Russia, &c. &c.? I can see no other [*sic*] claim which the Prayer-Book has on a layman's deference, as the teaching of the Church, which the Breviary and Missal have not in a far greater degree. I know you will snub me for this, and put in lots of *ἐνστάσεις*, some of which I could anticipate and answer; but it would take too much room, and I dare say you can augur the answers as well as I can the objections.

"Next, the tracts tell a great deal about the clergy 'teaching authoritatively.' Do you think that, on any fair principles of interpretation, the texts which claim authority for the teaching of inspired persons, and those in immediate communication with them, can be applied to the teaching of those who have no access to any source of information which is not equally open to all mankind? Surely, no teaching now-a-days is authoritative in the sense in which the Apostles' was, except that of the bible, nor any in the sense in which Timothy's was, except that of primitive tradition. To find a sense in which the teaching of the modern clergy is authoritative, I confess baffles me. Do you mean, that if his lordship of — taught one way, and Pascal or Robert Nelson another, the former would be entitled to most consideration? or do you give the preference to ordained persons, *cæteris paribus*? The former assertion would be startling; the latter does not come to much."—pp. 401-3.

"And now I will have another go at you, about your rule of faith in *fundamentals*. This is a supposed dialogue between you and the A.

"*Romanist*. I maintain that the doctrine of the Eucharist is a fundamental.—*You*. I deny it.—*R*. Why?—*You*. Because it cannot be proved from Scripture.—*R*. Supposing it granted, do you think that no doctrine is fundamental, which cannot be proved from Scripture?—*You*. Yes.—*R*. Supposing I can show that the early Christians (say of the second and third centuries) regarded the doctrine of the Eucharist as fundamental, should you still say that it was not so, because it cannot be proved from Scripture?—*You*. No; in that case I should admit that it was fundamental; but you cannot show it.—*R*. Then you admit your real reason for denying that this doctrine is fundamental, is not that it is not proved from Scripture, but that it was not held such by the early Christians.—*You*. My reason for denying that it is fundamental, is, that it is not proved from Scripture.—*R*. But, in spite of this reason, you would think it fundamental, if the Fathers thought so; that is, you admit your own reason to be inconclusive: that, even after you had shown that it cannot be proved from Scripture, you would also have to show that the Fathers did not think it fundamental.—*You*. I admit this; but still adhere to my original proposition.—*R*. You have admitted that it is not enough to show that a doctrine *cannot* be proved from Scripture, in order to prove it *not* funda-

mental. Do you think it enough to show that it *can* be proved from Scripture, in order to prove that it *is* fundamental?—*You*. No; I do not think that.—*R*. Then you have proposed, as a test of fundamentality, one which, being answered, does not prove doctrines fundamental; and not answered, does not prove them not so.

“I will not write any more about this, as I suspect you will skip.”—pp. 417-18.

A few days later, he reverts to the subject, in writing to the same friend; for he asks (July 30):—“What does the article mean by ‘doctrines necessary to salvation’? No doctrine is necessary to salvation, to those who have not rejected it wilfully; and to those that do reject wilfully, every true doctrine is necessary to salvation.” (p. 419.) Two months after this, he returns to his former controversy, and evidently shows his sense of the insufficiency of the grounds on which he and his friends stood regarding authority; for, Sept. 3, he writes thus:—

“As to our controversies, you are now taking fresh ground, without owning, as you ought, that on our first basis I dished you. Of course, if the Fathers maintain ‘that nothing not deducible from Scripture ought to be insisted on as terms of communion,’ I have nothing more to say. But again, if you allow tradition an interpretative authority, I cannot see what is gained. For surely the doctrines of the priesthood and the Eucharist may be proved from Scripture, interpreted by tradition; and if so, what is to hinder our insisting on them as terms of communion? I don’t mean, of course, that this will bear out the Romanists, which is, perhaps, your only point; but it certainly would bear out our *party* in excommunicating Protestants.”—pp. 419-20.

It is evident that his mind was busily engaged with this most important topic; and that every day showed him more and more the perplexity of the views taken by his colleagues, and the necessity of coming to a clearer understanding than they had of the extent of their principles, which, pushed one step farther, would be driven into Catholicity. A letter written to another correspondent, in November following, is evidence of this.

“Nov. 27.....I have been over and over again N[ewman]’s arguments from the Fathers, that tradition, in order to be authoritative, must be in form interpretative, and can get no farther than that it is a convenient reason for [the Church’s] tolerating the (I forget which) article. No reason why the Apostles should have confined their oral teaching to comments on Scripture, seems apparent; and why their oral teaching should have been more likely to be corrupted, *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*.”—p. 423.

His mortal course was now, however, drawing to a close; but the last fragment published of his attests how anxiously, how candidly, and how powerfully, his mind was at work with this great subject,—the hinge on which the differences between us and these new divines may be justly said to turn. This piece is a letter, dated Jan. 27, 1836, a month before his death; and as his last illness was of some weeks’ duration, this document may be considered his theological testimonial, the last declaration of his yet unbroken mind. It will clearly prove how far he had advanced beyond his fellows, towards the boundary line of Catholic truth. In order the better to understand it, I must refer to the last tract, No. 3, in which I examined the very passages alluded to in the following extract, which had not then come under my observation. I there cited the very example, as Mr. Froude does, of

the Patriarchate of Constantinople, in proof that the patriarchal rights of Churches, even though unjustly acquired, were in course of time respected, and held inviolable. (p. 293.) I also proved the canon of Ephesus, there quoted in defence of the independence of the Anglican Church, to speak only of *new* assumptions of jurisdiction by one bishop or patriarch over sees in which no right had previously been admitted. (p. 295.) The same view I find one of their own most zealous partizans and contributors to have spontaneously taken;—nay, we see him, in the concluding passage of his writings, using severer language to his friend Mr. Newman than I presumed to employ. The following are his words:—

“The other day accidentally put in my way the Tract on *the Apostolical Succession in the English Church*; and it really does seem so very unfair, that I wonder you could, even in the extremity of *οικονομία* and *φειλακισμός*, have consented to be a party to it. The Patriarchate of Constantinople, as every one knows, was not one ‘from the first;’ but neighbouring churches voluntarily submitted to it in the first instance, and then, by virtue of their oaths, remained its ecclesiastical subjects; and the same argument by which you justify England and Ireland, would justify all those churches in setting up any day for themselves. The obvious meaning of the canon [of Ephesus] is, that patriarchs might not *begin* to exercise authority in churches *hitherto* independent, without their consent.”—pp. 425-6.

After this, what more can we desire in proof of what I asserted at the beginning of this tract, that these *Remains* prove Mr. Froude’s mind to have been gradually discovering more extensive and more accurate views of religious truths and the principles of faith, with such steady and constant growth, as gives us every reason to believe that longer life alone was wanting to see him take the salutary resolve, to embrace the conclusions of his theories to their fullest legitimate extent? While the writings of the new divines seem to represent their theories as perfectly formed, and their views quite fixed, the extracts I have just made show them to be but the shifting and unsettled opinions of men who are yet discovering errors in what they have formerly believed, and seeking farther evidence of what they shall from henceforth hold. My concluding extract shall give fuller evidence of this fact: it is a letter to Mr. Newman, dated All Saint’s Day, 1835.

“Before I finish this, I must enter another protest against your cursing and swearing at the end of — [against the Romanists], as you do. What good can it do?—and I call it uncharitable to an excess. *How mistaken we may ourselves be on many points that are only gradually opening on us!* Surely you should reserve ‘blasphemous,’ ‘impious,’ &c., for denial of the articles of faith.”—p. 422.

With this passage I close Mr. Froude’s *Remains*. Peace be to him! is my parting salutation. The hope which an Ambrose expressed for a Valentinian, who died yet a Catechumen, I willingly will hold of him. His ardent desires were with the truth; his heart was not a stranger to its love. He was one, I firmly believe, whom no sordid views, or fear of men’s tongues, would have deterred from avowing his full convictions, and embracing their consequences, had time and opportunity been vouchsafed him for a longer and closer search. He is another instance of that same mysterious Providence, which guided a Grotius and a Leibnitz to the threshold of truth, but allowed them not the time to step within it, into the hallowed precincts of God’s visible Church.

















